

Vol. XXIV, No. 1]

cc. No.
3186

पुराणम्
PURĀṆA



(Half-yearly Bulletin of the Purāṇa-Department)

With the financial Assistance from the Ministry of Education,

Government of India

VASANTA PAÑCAMĪ NUMBER

आत्मा पुराणं वेदानाम्

SILVER JUBILEE NUMBER



ALL-INDIA KASHIRAJ TRUST
FORT, RAMNAGAR, VARANASI

Annual Subs.—Inland Rs. 50/-

Foreign £ 5

सम्पादक-मण्डल

डा० रामकरण शर्मा

उपशिक्षापरामर्शदाता, शिक्षामन्त्रालय तथा निदेशक, केन्द्रीय संस्कृत
संस्थान, नयी दिल्ली

डा० रामचन्द्र नारायण दाण्डेकर

भण्डारकर प्राच्यशोधसंस्थान, पुणे

डा० राजेन्द्र चन्द्र हाजरा

कलकत्ता

EDITORIAL BOARD

Dr. R. K. Sharma

Deputy Educational Advisor (Skt.) Govt. of India and Director,
Kendriya Sanskrit Sansthana, New Delhi.

Dr. R. N. Dandekar

Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Pune

Dr. R. C. Hazra

Calcutta

EDITOR

Ram Shankar Bhattacharya

M.A., Ph.D., Vyakaranacharya

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

Ganga Sagar Rai, M. A., Ph. D.

Giorgio Bonazzoli, M. A. (Milan), M. Th. (Rome)

Shrish Chandra Datta, M. A., Dip. Ed. (Edin.).

लेखकमहोदयैः प्रकटीकृता विचारास्तेषामेव स्वायत्ताः;

न पुनस्ते सम्पादकान् न्यासं च निबध्नन्ति

Authors are responsible for their views, which do not
bind the Editors and the Trust.

Authors are requested to use standard system of transliteration
and phonetic spellings when writing Sanskrit words in Roman letters.
They are also requested to use Devanāgarī letters for Sanskrit
ślokas and prose passages.

rec. No.
3186

पुराणम्—PURĀṆA

Vol. XXIV., No. 1]

वसन्तपञ्चम्यङ्कः

[January 30, 1982

लेखसूची—Contents

	Pages
1. विष्णुकृतं सावित्रीस्तोत्रम् [Eulogy of Savitrī by Viṣṇu] With Notes by R. S. Bhattacharya;	1-6
2. The Devī-Māhātmya in Greek : D. Galanos' Translation [श्रीकभाषायां देवीमाहात्म्यम्; डी० गैलानोस्कृतोऽस्यानुवादः] By Dr. Siegfried A. Schulz; Deptt. of Modern Languages and Literature, The Catholic University of America, Washington D. C. 20064—U.S.A.	7-40
3. The Words अम्बक and अम्बिका—Their Derivation and Interpretation [अम्बकाम्बिकासम्बद्धौ—तयोर्निर्वचनं व्याख्या च] By Dr. R. C. Hazra; P 555/B Panditiya Road Ext., Calcutta 700029	41-62
4. Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa on Ariṣṭas [विष्णुधर्मोत्तरपुराणे अरिष्टानां विवरणम्] By Dr. Lallanji Gopal; Professor of Ancient Indian History, Culture and Archaeology, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi—221005	63-78
5. <u>Kṛṣṇa</u> as a Portion of the <u>Supreme</u> , [परमतत्त्वस्यांशभूतः कृष्णः] By Dr. Noel Sheth; Inst. of Philosophy and Religion, Jnana Deepa Vidyapeeth, Pune 411014	79-90
6. <u>Vedic-Purāṇic Vinculum</u> [वेदपुराणयोः संयोजकं तत्त्वम्] By Dr. S. K. Lal; Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit; University of Poona, Ganeshkhind—Pune 411007	91-100
7. The Universality and Supremacy of Bhakti-Yoga, [भक्तियोगस्य सर्वव्यापकत्वं सर्वातिशायित्वं च] By Dr. Subhash Anand; Papal Seminary, Poona 411014	101-127

8. The Sahyādrī-khaṇḍa : Style and Context
as Indices of Authorship in the
Pātityagrāmanirṇaya
[सह्याद्रिखण्डान्तर्गतपातित्यग्रामनिर्णयभागस्य
रचयितुः सूचके रेचनाशैली-ग्रन्थस्वारस्ये]
By *Dr. Stephen Hylllyer Levitt*;
150-04 77th Road
Flushing, New York 11367—U.S.A. 128-145
9. Schemes in the Purāṇas [पुराणान्तर्गताः प्रकरणस्थापनक्रमाः] 146-189
By *Dr. Giorgio Bonazzoli*;
All India Kashiraj Trust
10. Is Kapila, the Founder of the Sāṃkhya-system,
Identical with the Destroyer of the Sons of the
King Sagara ?
[किं सांख्यमतसंस्थापकः कपिलः सगरसुतानां ध्वंसकृत् ?]
By *Dr. R. S. Bhattacharya*,
D. 38/8 Houz Katora, Varanasi 190-207

Notes and Comments

11. Location of the Naimiṣa forest [नैमिषारण्यस्यावस्थितिः] 208-217
By *O. P. Bharadwaja*; Chandigarh

Obituary [प्रायणवार्ता]

12. Shri Anand Swarup Gupta 218-225
By *Dr. Ganga Sagar Rai*
13. Activities of the All India Kashiraj Trust
[सर्वभारतीय-काशिराजन्यासस्य कार्यविवरणम्] 226-245
14. पञ्चमविश्वसंस्कृतसम्मेलनस्य स्वागतसमितेरध्यक्षाणां तत्रभवतां
महाराजानां डा० विभूतिनारायणसिंहमहोदयानां स्वागतभाषणम्
[Welcome address by H. H. Maharaja Dr. Vibhuti
Narain Singh, Chairman, Reception Committee to
the Vth World Sanskrit Conference] 246-247
15. **Book-Review**
Sāmba-Purāṇa (Hindi Translation) 248
Reviewed by *Dr. Ganga Sagar Rai*

विष्णुकृतं सावित्रीस्तोत्रम्

नमोऽस्तु ते महादेवि भूर्भुवः स्वस्-त्रयीमयि ।
सावित्रि दुर्गतरिणि त्वं वाणो सप्तधा मता ॥ ११५

सर्वाणि स्तुतिशास्त्राणि लक्षणानि तथैव च ।
भविष्या सर्वशास्त्राणां त्वं तु देवि नमोऽस्तु ते ॥ ११६

श्वेता त्वं श्वेतरूपाऽसि शशाङ्केन समानना ।
शशिरश्मिप्रकाशेन हरिणोरसि राजसे ।

दिव्यकुण्डलपूर्णाभ्यां श्रवणाभ्यां विभूषिता ॥ ११७
त्वं सिद्धिस्त्वं तथा ऋद्धिः कीर्तिः श्रीः सन्ततिर्मतिः ।

सन्ध्या रात्रिः प्रभातस्त्वं कालरात्रिस्त्वमेव च ॥ ११८
कर्षुकाणां यथा सीता भूतानां धारिणी तथा ।

[एवं स्तुवन्तं सावित्री विष्णुं प्रोवाच सुव्रता ॥ ११९]

(स्कन्दपु. प्रभासखण्ड १६५।११५-११९; वङ्गवासिसंस्क०, वेङ्कटेश्वरसंस्क०;
उभयत्र समानः पाठः) ।

NOTES

Once Brahmā began to perform a sacrifice. As Sāvitrī, his wife, was busy with her household duties, she delayed in coming to the sacrificial ground. Consequently Brahmā asked Indra to find a girl whom he could marry in order to perform the sacrifice. Accordingly Indra brought Gāyatrī, a cowherd girl (*gopālakanyā*) and Brahmā married her.

Having come to know about the second marriage of her husband, Sāvitrī became highly enraged and cursed the gods, namely Indra, Rudra, Agni and others. Viṣṇu tried to propitiate Sāvitrī by uttering the aforesaid eulogy. She, being pleased, bestowed on Viṣṇu the boon that he would be unconquerable and also dear to his parents in all his incarnations (अवतारे सदा वत्स पितृमातृसुवत्सलः, 120).

It is wellknown that Sāvitrī and Gāyatrī have been variously depicted in the Purāṇas and allied literature. They are regarded not only as identical but also as friends. In some places they are mentioned as the wives of Brahmā and in a few places as his daughters. A somewhat similar relation of Sāvitrī to Sarasvatī is also found in the Purāṇas.¹ We refrain here from disclosing the esoteric meanings of these Purāṇic statements.

Brief explanations of the important expressions in this *stotra* are given below. (As the sentences are easily understandable full translations of the verses a.e not given here).

भूर्भुवःस्वस्-त्रयीमयि (vocative case)—It may be explained in two ways: (1) Sāvitrī is identical with the group (of three) consisting of भूस्, भुवस् and स्वस्; and (2) Sāvitrī is identical with भूस्, भुवस्, स्वस् as well as with त्रयी. The first interpretation has its basis in such Vedic statements as भूर्भुवस्स्वरिति या त्रयी विद्या (Jai. Up. Br. 2. 9. 7) and एवमेवेता (i. e. भूर्भुवस्स्वः) व्याहृतयस् त्रयै विद्यायै संश्लेषिण्यः (Kau. Br. 6. 12). There are a number of interpretations of these three expressions (called *vyāhrtis*). They are usually taken as representing

1. Vide the paper 'Conception of Sarasvatī in the Purāṇas' by Shri Ananda Swarup Gupta (Purāṇa IV. I) for various conceptions of Sāvitrī, Gāyatrī and Sarasvatī.

the three regions, namely the earth (पृथिवी), atmosphere (अन्तरिक्ष) and heaven (दिव्); cp. एता वै (i. e. भूर्भुवस्स्वः) व्याहृतय इमे लोकाः (Tai. Br. 2.24.3).

In the second interpretation *trayī* (a group having three parts) stands for *trayī vidyā* i. e. the lore concerning the three kinds of *mantras*, namely ṛc, yajus and sāman. Usually *trayī* refers to that part of the Veda which deals with the sacrificial acts (*karmakāṇḍa*) as distinct from the Upaniṣadic part which deals with *jñānakāṇḍa*; vide Śrīdhara's comment on Bhāgavata 10.8.45 (त्रय्या चोपनिषद्भिश्च) which clearly points out the distinction between the contents of the *trayī* and of the Upaniṣads. *Trayī* is also used in the sense of the four Vedas in authoritative works.

दुर्गतरिणि (vocative case)—Both *tariṇī* and *taraṇī* mean a raft or a boat. 'You are like the boat to cross difficulties or calamities (i. e. the sorrowful world)'. *Durga* has been taken here as a noun; it may be taken as an adjective also (the noun *samsāra* being understood). Expressions having a similar sense² are often found to have been used in connection with deities and spiritual teachers.

सप्तधा वाणी—The sevenfold division of speech seems to be an established idea of ancient sages as it is found in the Asyavāmīya hymn of the R̥g-Veda—गायत्रेण प्रतिमिमीते अकं....अक्षरेण मिमते सप्त वाणोः (1.164.24). According to Sāyaṇa they are the seven metres.³ One may take the seven *śvaras* (namely *ṣaḍja*, etc.) as the seven forms of speech.

स्तुतिशास्त्राणि—Sāvitrī is said to be identical with all *stutiśāstras*. Since there is no *śāstra* (treatise) dealing with eulogies, the word seems to be a corrupt form of the original reading. We are inclined to read the word as स्तुतिशास्त्राणि—a reading which is in conformity with the context. *Stutis* (i. e. *stotras*) and *śāstras* are wellknown in the field of Vedic sacrificial acts. A *śāstra* is defined as प्रगीतमन्त्रसाध्या स्तुतिः (a laud that is sung to a melody) and a *stotra* as अप्रगीतमन्त्रसाध्या स्तुतिः (a laud that is only recited); vide Pūrvamīmāṃsā

2. Cp. भवसागरनौका, भवार्णवतरणि, भवाब्धिपोत, etc.

3. Cp. तामाभूत्या व्यदधुः पुरुषा तां सप्त रेभा अभि सं नवन्ते (RV. 10.71. 3)—'They brought speech (vāc), dealt her forth in many places; seven singers make her tone resound in contrast.'

sūtras 2.1.13, 10.4.49, 7.2.17 with commentaries).⁴ Since a *śastra* belongs to a *stotra* and always follows a *stotra*, the word *śastra* seems to have been used after the word *stuti* (i. e. *stotra*). It is quite likely that ignorant scribes changed the word *śastra* to the wellknown word *śāstra*⁵

लक्षणानि—the word लक्षण in its usual senses of characteristic, sign, defining attribute, etc. does not yield a good sense. On account of its placing with words expressive of Vedic matter, it is justified to take this word as referring to the *lakṣaṇa*-works (i. e. works bearing the word *lakṣaṇa* in their names) dealing with Vedic subjects. A list of such works are found in the Atharvaparīṣiṣṭa. Besides these we have independent works of a similar nature, such as *Mātrālakṣaṇa* etc. *Sāvitṛī* is identified here with the *lakṣaṇa* works i. e. with the subjects dealt with in these works.

त्वं सर्वशास्त्राणां भविष्य—The word भविष्य (ending in ञ) is found in Purāṇic literature in the place of the strictly grammatical form भविष्यत्. As भविष्यत् literally means 'to be about to become or come to pass', we may take it here in the sense of 'the goal to be acquired' (with the help of the *śāstras*) or 'the thing to be proved, established or expounded' (by the *śāstras*). Most probably the reading is corrupt and we may correct it to भाष्याणि सर्वशास्त्राणाम्, 'you are the scholia of all *śāstras*'.

एवेता त्वं स्वेतरूपासि—Since *Sāvitṛī* is identical with *Sarasvatī*, she is considered as having white complexion.

शशाङ्केन समानना—The expression समानना (a compound word) in connection with शशाङ्केन is grammatically indefensible, though such compounds are often met with in the Purāṇas and the poetical works. One would prefer to read शशाङ्कसदृशानना (one whose face resembles the moon).

4. स्तोत्रं नाम सामसंज्ञकगतयुतमन्त्रपाठेन स्तुतिः; शस्त्रं नाम केवलैः पठ्यमानमन्त्रैः संपाद्यमाना स्तुतिः. Śāstras are recited by the hotṛ priest and his assistants. The ṛc used in a śastra is called śasyā (Śaṅkara's bhāṣya on Bṛ. Up. 3.1.7).

5. Bhāgavata-p. 3.12.37 (second half), evidently reads शस्त्रम् though we find शāस्त्रम् in a few editions of this Purāṇa.

शशिरश्मिप्रकाशेन हरिणोरसि राजसे—‘You shine on the breast of the dear with the help of the light of the moon’. The significance of this sentence is not quite clear. हरिणोरस् may be the same as मृगाङ्क, the moon. To mention Sāvitrī’s existence on the moon does not serve any purpose. Moreover, there is no reason for stating शशिरश्मिप्रकाश as a means for Sāvitrī’s shining (राजसे) on the moon. Even if we take हरिणोरसि in the sense of ‘on the mark of the deer as found in the moon’, yet no better sense is expressed. A conjecture may be hazarded that since the *mṛgāṅka* (deer mark) is believed to be the shadow of the earth,⁶ it must have been supposed as devoid of light and as such it was necessary to mention शशिरश्मिप्रकाश in order to make the act of shining (राजसे) possible.

Most probably हरिणोरसि is a corrupt reading. May we correct it to हारेणोरसि ? In this reading no difficulty arises. A necklace (*hāra*) may aptly be described as शशिरश्मिप्रकाश (one which shines like the rays of the moon).

कुण्डल—An ear-ring (कुण्डले कर्णविष्टने सुवतुले, Śāntanavī on Saptasatī 2.24).

Sāvitrī is said to be identical with *siddhi*, *ṛddhi*, etc. It is a figurative statement. In fact, she (i. e. her grace) is the means of acquiring *siddhi* etc. Such figurative statements are always found in eulogies.

सिद्धि, perfection; ऋद्धि, increase, abundance or wealth; कीर्ति, renown or precisely renown on account of righteousness; sometimes *kīrti* is said to be that renown which is unknown to oneself (आत्मपरोक्षं हि विश्वतत्त्वं कीर्तिः, Śaṅkara on Chān. Up. 3.13.4).

श्री, prosperity, fortune, majesty; सन्तति, offspring, race, lineage; it also means ‘continuous flow’, i. e. the unending flow of the mundane existence; मति reflection, ratiocination : मतिर्मननं तर्को मन्तव्यविषये आदरः (Śaṅkara on Chān. Up. 7.18.1).

सन्ध्या—Usually the juncture of the three divisions of the day (i. e. morning, noon and evening) is called *sandhyā*. Sāvitrī is figuratively identified with these periods. The religious act performed

6. मृगाकारा भूच्छाया अङ्गुलस्य (The comm. Trikaṇḍacintāmaṇi on the word मृगाङ्क, Amarakośa 1.3.14).

at the aforesaid three divisions is also called *sandhyā*, and *Sāvitrī* may be considered as identical with this act. The word may be directly applied to *Sāvitrī* if it is derived as सन्धी उपास्या (to be worshipped in *sandhyā*).

कालरात्रि—A dark night. Usually it is taken in the sense of 'the night of destruction at the end of the world'; vide the commentaries on *Saptaśatī* 1.59.⁷ It also means 'the fourteenth day of the dark half of *Kārttika* associated with the fifteenth day of a lunar month' (अमावस्यायुक्तभूतचतुर्दशी).

कर्षुकाणां यथा सीता भूतानां धारिणी तथा—'As a *sītā* is the *dhāriṇī* of the *karṣukas* so you are the *dhāriṇī* of the *bhūtas*'. *Karṣuka* must be derived from *karṣū* with the suffix *ka* (स्वार्थिक क). The long *ū* in *karṣū* is shortened by केञ्: (Pā. 7.4.13). The only meaning of *karṣū* that may be conceived here is *vārtā*, which must be taken in the restricted sense of *kṛṣi* only and not in the senses of the tending or or rearing of cattle (*paśupālana*) and trade (*vāṇijya*) as has been stated by the comm. *Trikāṇḍacintāmaṇi* on *Amara* 3.3.222. *Sītā* is the track or line of a ploughshare, or a ploughed land; it also means the forepart of a plough (हलार्ध). *Dhāriṇī*—one that sustains, preserves or supports. भूतऽ are either the living beings or the five elements. Thus the significance of the simile becomes clear. Most probably कर्षुक is a scribal error for कर्षक, ploughman, cultivator.

—Ram Shankar Bhattacharya

-
7. कालरात्रिरिति । दैनन्दिनप्रलयरूपा (गुप्तवती); कालो मरणं तदुपलक्षिता रात्रिः कल्पान्तरात्रिरित्यर्थः (चतुर्धरी); कालरात्रिः जगत्संहारकारिणी यामभङ्गिनी (यमभगिनी) यत्र प्रलीयते जगत् सा कालरात्रिः (शान्तनवी); कालरात्रिरिति ब्रह्मलयोपलक्षिता (नागोजीमट्टी).

THE DEVI-MĀHĀTMYA IN GREEK : D. GALANOS'
TRANSLATION*

By

SIEGFRIED A. SCHULZ

[डेमेट्रियस् गैलेनोस्-नामा कश्चिद् ग्रीसदेशीयः १७९३ ख्रीष्टीयाब्दे वाराणस्याम् उवास; तस्य तात्कालिक-काशीनरेशेन सह संबन्धो जातः । मुन्शी-शीतलसिंहेन अनुरुद्धः सन् स हितोपदेश-भागवतादीन् संस्कृतग्रन्थान् ग्रीकभाषयानूदितवान् ।

देवीमाहात्म्यस्य (सप्तशतीत्यपरनामधेयस्य) ग्रीकभाषयानुवादोऽप्य-
नेन कृतः । अनुवादे ५७८ संख्यकानि पद्यानि सन्ति । टायपलडोस्-महोदयेन
१८५३ ख्रीष्टीयाब्दे एथेन्स्-नगरीतः टिप्पण्यादीन् संयोज्य ग्रन्थस्यास्य
प्रकाशनं कृतम् । गैलेनोस्-कृत-ग्रन्थादि-विषयानधिकृत्य टायपलडोस्-महोदयेन
बहु विचारितम् ।

गैलेनोस्-कृतेन सप्तशत्यनुवादेन सह मूलग्रन्थो न संयुक्तो वर्तते,
अतः कीदृशाः सप्तशतीपाठास्तेन दृष्टा इति न प्रत्यक्षतो ज्ञातुं शक्यते ।
ग्रीकानुवाददर्शनेन बहुत्र गैलेनोस्-दृष्टाः सप्तशतीश्लोकपाठा अनुमातुं शक्यन्ते ।
सप्तशतीपाठविषये विचारं कुर्वता लेखकेन स्वामिजगदीश्वरानन्दसम्पादित-
सप्तशतीग्रन्थस्य डा० वासुदेवशरणाग्रवालसम्पादितसप्तशतीग्रन्थस्य च
साहाय्यं गृहीतम् ।

लेखकेनेदं दर्शितं यद् ग्रीकानुवादे मूलग्रन्थस्य केचन शब्दाः शब्दांशा
वा त्यक्ताः; केषाञ्चन शब्दानां तादृशा अर्थाः दर्शिता ये विशेषतो
लक्षणीया विचाराहर्षिच; केषाञ्चन शब्दानामर्था न प्रदत्ताः; क्वचित्
सामान्यार्थकाः शब्दा विशेषार्थकाः स्वीकृताः, क्वचिच्च विशेषार्थकाः शब्दाः
सामान्यार्थकाः । केषुचित् संस्करणेषु पठिताः केचन श्लोका अनुवादकेन
न गृहीताः । यद्यपि एवंविधा विभिन्नतावलोक्यते, तथापि भेदोऽयम-
किञ्चित्करः । ग्रीकभाषास्वभावहेतुकान्यपि कानिचन प्रयोगवैचित्र्याणि
दृश्यन्ते ।

अनुवादक-प्रयुक्तां ग्रीकभाषाम् अधिकृत्य निबन्धान्ते विचारः कृतो
निबन्धलेखकेन ।]

* We apologize for not reproducing diacritical marks in the transliteration of Greek words [Ed.]

A native of Athens (Greece) and resident of Vārāṇasī from about 1793 until his death in 1833, Demetrios Galanos (b. 1760)¹ was closely linked to the Banaras Raj through his friendship with Munshi Sital Singh² who may have inspired him to translate some of the important Sanskrit works. In Galanos' "Last Will and Testament" a passage reads, "I also will and desire that out of the eight hundred Rupees now in the hands of Moonshey Seetul Singh, four hundred be paid to any person or persons duly Authorized to receive the same for a piece of ground in the Church yard for my burial...." and the *Indikon Metaphrasen Prodomos D. Galanou* (i. e. "Forerunner of D. Galanos' Indian Translation"), Athens, 1845 contains an epitaph allegedly composed in Hindustani by Munshi Sital Singh, "a wise Brahmin (!), friend and teacher" which reads in translation (from Greek): "Woe, a hundred times! Demetrios Galanos has gone away from this world to the eternal monads. Woe me! weeping and wailing have I said it. I am out of myself. Ah, he has gone away, the Plato of this century!" (p. XXX)

While we do not, at present, know much about Galanos' life-

1. For more details see : S. A. Schulz, "A Greek in India: Galanos" *Bharati* (B. H. U., College of Indology) 9, II (1965/66) 81-102; id. : "Demetrios Galanos (1760-1833): A Greek Indologist" *Journal of the Am. Oriental Soc.* 89.2 (1969) 339-356; id. : "Demetrios Galanos, a Greek Scholar in India" *German Scholars on India*, vol. II (New Delhi 1976) 251-263.
2. Comparatively little is known about Munshi Sital Singh. Sketchy details regarding Sital Singh appear in the *History of Benares Raj* (in Persian) on pp. 342 and 543 (Lucknow, no date). Born in 1776 (?) he entered the services of Raja Udit Narain Singh as a "musaheb" about 1816, was an accomplished linguist, administrator, a master in the knowledge of "Hikmat" and a great poet who wrote under the name "Bekhud". H. H. Wilson in *Religious Sects of the Hindus* (published posthumously in 1861) reprint, ed. E. R. Rose (Calc. 1952) p. 4, says, ".... I have derived from the groundwork of the whole account [i.e. the "Sketch of the Religious Sects...." in *Asiatic Researches* 1828 and 1832] from two works (in Persian), one by Mathura Nath, a librarian of the Hindu College [Varanasi] and the other was compiled by Sital Singh, Munshi to the Raja of Banaras". He died on December 18, 1854.

style and the circle of friends whom he frequented,³ he cannot be called a philosopher in the sense of Plato when we judge Galanos according to the writings which were bequeathed to and are kept at the National Library of Greece at Athens.⁴ There he appears as an extraordinarily well-educated man who was not only familiar with the writings pertaining to the Greek-Orthodox faith and the Christian Church,⁵ but also with the ancient classical world, as well as with a number of foreign languages.

Unfortunately, there are very few original Sanskrit texts in the Galanos collection of manuscripts, the bulk of which consists of Greek translations of a variety of Sanskrit works, and of materials

3. According to Bishop Heber (*Narrative of a Journey Through the Upper Provinces*, 3 vols. (London, 1828) Galanos "was a partner in a Greek house in Calcutta, but is now [i.e. 1824] said to have retired from business ... [He] is a well-informed and well-mannered man ... living on his means, whatever they are, and professing to study Sanskrit ... [I] was much struck by the singularity and mystery of his character and situation. He is a very good scholar in the ancient language of his country, and speaks good English, French, and Italian. His manners are those of a gentleman, and he lives like a person at his ease. He has little intercourse with the English, but is on very friendly terms with the principal Hindoo families ... So few Europeans, however, who can help it, reside in India, that it seems strange that any man should prefer it as a residence, without some stronger motive than a fondness for Sanscrit literature, more particularly since he does not appear to meditate any work on the subject". (I, 436).
4. In Galanos' last will all his "Sanskrit Books, Writings, translations and Meninski's Dictionary in three volumes" were given and bequeathed "to the principal Academy at Athens". Gennadios in a 43-page reprint of the Greek periodical *Hellenismos*, Feb.—April 1930, maintains that the Galanos materials went first to London and reached Greece only in 1837, four years after G.'s death. The manuscripts were assigned the official numbers 1836-55. *Doyrga* is the third part of Ms. No. 1842. Cf. *JAOS*, 89.2 (1969) 339-347 for detailed description. A very cursory description appeared in *Giornale della Societa Asiatica Italiana* XXVI (1912), 179-81 by P. E. Pavolini.
5. Galanos' training was that of a future priest of the Greek-Orthodox faith. He attended the Seminary attached to the monastery of St. John Theologos on the island of Patmos. For more details see *ibid.* pp. 348 ff.

for Sanskrit-Greek dictionaries. When evaluating D. Galanos' *Devīmāhātmya* translation, this writer had to rely on the Sanskrit texts provided by two modern Indian scholars of great repute.⁶

The Greek title of our book is (in transliteration) : *Doyrga Metaphrastheisa ek toy Brachmanikoy para Demetrio y Galanoy, Athenaioy* (i. e. : Durgā, transl. from the Brahmanic language by Demetrios Galanos, an Athenian) now published for the first time in Greek and enriched by introductory remarks and observations, at the expense and under the care of George K. Typaldos, Inspector of the Public and University Library; Athens, 1853. The publisher dedicated this seventh (and last) volume of Galanos translations to His Majesty, Otto I, King of Greece.

1. Typaldos' observations and notes (pp. 5—39)

At the very outset of his notes, Typaldos announces that, in spite of his earlier promise (in vol. VI, p. 4 : *Hitopadesa*, 1851) he would not be able to publish the Bhāgavata purāṇa translation by Galanos, since many chapters had either not been translated or were lost in transit, and since the cost of publishing this book—estimated at 5,000 drachmas—“would tax me beyond my means.”⁷

Typaldos mentions several times the short description and survey given by Eugene Burnouf in *Journal Asiatique* IV (1824), 24; 51 : “Analyse et extrait du Devi Mahatmyam, fragment du Marcandeya Purana,” and Ludwig Poley's Latin translation of the

6. a) V. S. Agrawala, देवीमाहात्म्यम् The Glorification of the Great Goddess, All-India Kashiraj Trust, Ramnagar (Varanasi) 1963.

b) Svāmī Jagadīśvarānanda, *The Devīmāhātmyam or Śrī Durgā-Saptatī*, Sri Ramakrishna Math (Madras, 1955). In both versions, Sanskrit texts and English translations vary remarkably little except that the S.J. edition stretches the counting of ślokas to 700, while Ag.'s edition shows 577 (Gal. has 578 Greek stanzas).

7. Vol. III. 5 (henceforth abbreviated as *Gal*). E. Burnouf (1801-52) published only parts I-III of the *Bh. -P. ou histoire poetique de Krichna* (Paris 1840-47); M. Hauvette-Besnault and P. Roussel completed the French translation much later (Paris, 1884 and 1898).

same which appeared 1831 in Berlin.⁸ The Greek editor also refers the reader to the introductory remarks in previous Galanos books, which contain general information, culled from the works of 19th century European Indologists and "litterateurs."⁹

There are also these learned references : to Holy Scripture; to the early Christian writers and Fathers of the Church, (Eusebius,

8. The note in Ag.'s "Preface" (p. I) is misleading. L. Poley; although it matters little, was a German scholar whom Bopp, in a letter written on March 31, 1832 to Burnouf's father, recommended as "*un ancien eleve*" Of. E. Windisch, *Geschichte der Sanskrit-Philologie und Indischen Altertumskunde* I (Strassburg, 1917) 94 f. Poley's book was published in Berlin. The Roman numbers should read MDCCCXXXI (i. e. 1831).
9. E. g. a) Friedrich Adelung's *Bibliotheca Sanscrita, Literatus der Sanskritsprache* (St. Petersburg, 2/1837). Adelung's book—he cheerfully admitted that he did not know Sanskrit—abounds with egregious mistakes, but contains some useful information, culled from the works of the great philologists; b) the French *Mythologie des Indous* arranged by the canoness Lady de Polier from authentic manuscripts brought from India by the late Colonel de Polier (a native of Lausanne, Switzerland, who was for years in the services of the East India Company), Paris, 1809; c) *Catalogue des manuscrits sanscrits de la bibliotheque imperiale* "With notes on the content of most of the works, etc." (Paris 1807) by A. Hamilton and L. Langles (pp. 54—61 about the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa d.). Strangely enough, also Louis-Mathieu Langles (1763—1824) had, apart from Persian, no deeper knowledge of Oriental languages (Windisch., *op cit.* p. 205); d) Christian Lassen (1800—1876) who encouraged Typaldos to publish Galanos' works and whose extraordinary *Indische Alterthumskunde* 4 vols. (1847—62) took into account and digested all the important writings on Indological subjects; e) the Rev. Gaspare Gorresio (1808—91), a student of Burnouf's and renowned for his *Rāmāyaṇa* edition and Italian translation, based on a Bengali recension : *Ramayana Poema Indiano di Valmici, Testo Sanscrito secondo i Codici Manoscritti della Scuola Gaudana*, 12 vols. (Paris, 1843—1870). Cf. Windisch, *op. cit.* pp. 145f. Also Angelo de Gubernatis (1840—1913) *Materiaux pour servir a l'Histoire des Etudes Orientales en Italie* (Turin, 1876). De Gubernatis's *Piccolo Enciclopedia Indiana* (Turin, 1967) is dedicated "A Gaspare G., primo editore, primo traduttore in Europa del poema il Ramayana". On p. 19 of Gub. 's *Cenni sopra alcuni Indtaniisti viventi* (Florence, 1872) Galanos and the notorious Captain Kaiphala (cp. *JAOS* 89, 2 [1969] pp. 340, 350 ff.) are mentioned.

St. Augustine, John Chrysostomus, John of Damascus, Basil, Athanasius, Theodoretos, Origin, Clement of Alexandria); to the "founder" of Neo-Platonism, Plotinus (205—270 A. D.); to the *Apollodori Bibliotheca*, the great storehouse of mythological material, theogonies, and Greek chronicles (a book wrongly attributed to Apollodorus of Athens, 2nd cent. B. C.); to Philostratos, the Greek Sophist from the island of Lemnos who allegedly wrote the romantic life story of Apollonius of Tyana, an ascetic and miracle worker of the 1st cent. A. D.; to Hesiod's *Theogony* which is an account of the origin of the (Greek) world and the birth of the gods; to the Greek historian Herodotus; to Plutarch (born around 50 A. D.), the famous story-teller and sketcher of characters; to the mythical Orpheus (who supposedly lived before Homer) and "his" *Argonautica*, an epic poem dealing with the expedition of the Argonauts; to the *Historical Library* (40 volumes) by Diodorus Siculus, a Sicilian historian, contemporary of Julius Caesar, and widely-travelled in Asia, Africa and Europe; to Lucianus, a Greek satirist born in Syria (2nd cent. A.D.), known for his merciless exposure of human foibles, and most certainly not a favorite of the earlier Christians whose saints and traditions he mocked.¹⁰ Typaldos also refers to Homer (*Od.* II, 545; *Il.* XIX, 87—94) and to Plato's dialogues, "Timaeus" (on the mythical island of Atlantis) and "Phaedrus", Socrates' devoted pupil. There is also mentioned a verse from Euripides' drama *Melannipe*—T. does not say whether from *Mel. Captive* or *Mel. Sapiens*—"Just as heaven and earth were one form, before they were ripped asunder. They built everything and sent forth to the light : trees, winged creatures, wild animals which the brine nourishes, and the race of the mortals." Frequently, T. also refers to the cosmogony of the ancient Persians as described in the *Zend-Avesta*, the study of which had been initiated at his time in Western Europe. (He quotes from a book by Roun-Dehesh (p. 19), to which this

10. Typaldos cites Lucian's treatise "On the Syrian Goddess" where the peculiar cult of pillar climbing is described. That cult "may have influenced the holy Syrian stylite monks, who lived for years on lofty pillars". Cf. H. A. Musurillo, *The Fathers of the Primitive Church* (New York 1966) p. 108.

writer has no access.¹¹) Twice he quotes from Dupuis' *Religion Universelle*¹²; the half title of its German translation (Stuttgart, 1839) describes the work as presenting "the historical development of superstition and the control exercised by priests in all nations at all times", while an English translation (New York, 1849) characterizes Dupuis' book as an "explanation of an apocalyptical work of the initiated in the mysteries of the light, or sun, adored under the symbol of the lamb of spring, or the celestial ram..."

There is also a somewhat cryptic note (p. 13, repeated p. 14) on "Stephanos ho Gobaros" with reference to Photius' *Bibliothēke* (Codex 232, p. 289; Berlin edition.)¹³

11. The book is not mentioned in J. Darmesteter's very thorough "Introduction" of *The Zend-Avesta* (Oxford, 1895 : *Sacred Books of the East*) Critical bibliography pp. XIII—LXXXIX.
12. Charles Francois Dupuis (1742—1809); the full title of the seven volumes+atlas is *Origine de tous les cultes, ou, Religion universelle* Paris, 1795, with many later editions. *La Biographie Universelle ou Dictionnaire Historique* (Paris, 1834) vol. IV, 455 condemns that work (in transl. :) "as being one of the most impious productions in recent times, worthy of being relegated to oblivion, because of its indigestible erudition which reigns there, and because of the vague incoherence, the arbitrariness and absurdity of its system". Volumes III, IV and V deal with Sun worship, Religious Mysteries, and Mythology. However, Typaldos quotes from vol. I (on "Religions"), II ("Early Astronomy") and III ("Sun Worship").
13. Photius (about 820—891 A. D.), twice Patriarch of Constantinople, then relegated to a monastery, is the author of the *Bibliothēke*, also known as "Myriobiblon". i. e. "thousands of books" in which he gives excerpts and contents of and critical comments on books of his era; some of these books are not preserved and known only through Photius' encyclopedic work. Also Stephanus Gobarus' rather obscure book is described there. Photius calls it insignificant and put together only to impress the reader : in regard to Galanos' translation Typaldos' reference to St. G. is irrelevant. He was a Monophysite monk (about 550 A. D.) who like Cyril of Alexandria, the founder of this schismatic and heretical movement within the Eastern Orthodox Church, held that because of the preponderance of the divine nature over the human in Jesus Christ, the latter possessed only one (*monē*) i. e. divine nature (*physis*). Cf. : A. von Harnack, "The 'sic et non' of St. G". *Harvard Theological Review* 16, (1923), 205—234; (with compl. translation).

2. Galanos' Greek Translation : "Doyrga"

As mentioned previously, the Galanos manuscripts kept at Athens Library do not contain the Sanskrit text from which Galanos translated into Greek. Any inferences as to the text he used can be made only from the wording in the Greek translation. For the purposes of this study, the Greek version has been compared with V. S. Agrawala's *देवीमाहात्म्यम्* "The Glorification of the Great Goddess" (Rāmnagar Vārāṇasī, 1963) and Svāmī Jagadīśvarānanda's *The Devī-Māhātmyam or Śrī Durgā-Śaptasatī* (Mylapore-Madras, 1955), Sanskrit texts and English translations ¹⁴

Chapter I. Galanos' Greek version omits the customary greetings to Caṇḍikā and does not mention the circumstances in which Mārkaṇḍeya addresses his disciple, or explain the names of persons and of the various family lineages (transliteration of स्वरोचिषः, चैत्रः, सुरषः, कोलाविध्वंसिनः : *Svarokissas, Saitra, Soyratas, Kolavidvansai*).

The King Suratha, now deprived of his realm, sees the hermitage of the Saint Vasiṣṭha (not of the twice-born Medhas) who from now on is referred to only as "the Saint" (*ho hosios*), even though the Sanskrit text calls him at times मुनि. The brave chief-elephant's name सदाशिव is omitted, and the merchant who appears on the scene is simply called (in transliteration) : *Vaisseas* after he has introduced himself as (trsl. :) *Sammades*, also *Samaddes*. In verse 37 (Ag. I, 36; S.J. I. 49) Galanos translates पशुपक्षिमृगादयः as 'four-legged animals, reptiles and fowl' and leaves out the honorific term "O Tiger among men" in the following verse. Instead of "Knower of Brahman" (Ag. I. 46; S.J. I. 62) Galanos translates "O foremost among recognisers of God." "Prajāpati Brahmā" is translated as *demiourgos* (Creator, Progenitor), and "Janārdana" simply as Viṣṇu. Brahmā's song of praise (Gal. I. 54-68; Ag. 54-67; S.J. 73-87) starts out as "I praise you, divine Nidrā" which is explained in a note : "Yoganidrā is called the sweet and deep sleep and the Goddess as the Guardian of sleep" and a subsequent note adds, "and she is thus also understood to be Matter (*Hyle*) itself." The names स्वाहा and स्वधा appear in Greek transliteration, but वषट्कारः

14. Henceforth abbr. as (Ag.+verse), (S.J.), (Gal.).

as "sacrifice", स्वरात्मिका as "every one of the vowel elements", सुषा as 'ambrosia', and "you are the eternal syllable OM and the three-fold verse meter" (Gal. 55). "You are every one of the consonant elements, which cannot be pronounced without the vowels. You are Sāvitrī herself, you the great Goddess and Mother." (Gal. 56) This verse was apparently greatly simplified and has become much more lucid than S.J.'s version I. 74 : "You are half a mātṛā, though eternal. You are verily that which cannot be uttered specifically" or Ag. I. 55 : "The eternal half-mātṛā is also thyself, which being of universal connotation is difficult to be expressed through utterance."—Agrawala ignores the mention of Sāvitrī and the supreme जननी in his Sanskrit text. Gal. 58 has for संहृतिरूपान्त ("the totality of the world form is thyself" Ag. 57) simply *o pantomorphe*, "O you one of all forms." While Gal. 59 (Ag. 58, S.J. 77) translates all appellatives into Greek (great Wisdom, Matter, Intellect, Remembrance, Madness (*i. e. paranoia*), Great Goddess and "great strength of the gods" (instead of "asurī"), the following verse, after the mention of "the Power behind Everthing," the Power bringing together the three qualities—on which Galanos (or the editor) does not elaborate—the Greek author mentions Devī's other appellatives in their Sanskrit forms : the terrible *Kalatre* (obvious misprint for Kālārātri), *Mahārātre* and *Moharātre* (Gal. 60). Also without any explanation, there is in Gal. 61 : "You are Sre (Śrī), you are the ruler (*kyria* for ईश्वरी)" followed by Greek descriptions : "You are modesty, you are the intellectual and perceptive power, you are diffidence, encouragement (*rhosis*), joy, pleasure, and forbearance." Verse 63 of the Galanos translation is again greatly simplified : "You are the most beautiful of all; you are better than everything perceptible and intelligent; you are the great *Kyria*." Also verse 66 (Ag. 65; S.J. 84) varies from the two English versions : "Who would be able, O Goddess, to praise you, the very same matter from which we have our body; myself, Viṣṇu and Śiva." The two *asuras* (Maddou and Kaitabba) are called "giants" (Gal. 67, 68).

In Gal. 69 (Ag. 68; S.J. 89) the translation for देवी तामसी —Ag. calls her the Goddess Tāmasī (Darkness)—is "Goddess of Sleep"; for वेद्यस् "creator" Galanos uses Brahmā. In the following verses जनार्दन is *pantokrator*¹⁵ *i. e.* ("omnipotent") Viṣṇu and

15. This is a non-classical word, denoting exclusively (the Christian) God Almighty.

भगवान् हरि is “God Viṣṇu” who, in Galanos’ words “boxed and wrestled” (I. 73) with the “giants.” Instead of the epithet केशव Galanos uses Viṣṇu again. Both Ag. I. 76a प्रीतो स्वस् तव युद्धेन इलाध्यस्त्वं-मृत्युरावयोः and Gal. I. 77 translate this verse approximately the same: “We are pleased with the battle you have given us, and death from you is praiseworthy to us,” while SJ. omits it completely.

Chapter II. Like the modern translators, Galanos uses Indra’s name instead of “Destroyer of castles” (पुरन्दरः) and calls the Asuras “anti-divine giants.” In the Galanos description of Mahiṣa’s new authority usurped from the Gods, there is a mixture of Greek mythological names (*Helios* = Sūrya, *Pyr* = Agni, *Aer* = Vāyu, *Selene* = Candra) and Sanskrit names like Indra and Varuṇa. (Gal. II. 5; Ag. II. 5; SJ. II. 6). When the gods become angry a great fire issues forth from their mouths (Gal. II. 9-17) while in Ag.’s translation it is “fierce heat” and in SJ.’s version (II, 9-19) “a great light.” In the course of enumeration of body parts produced by the light or fire, Galanos apparently has overlooked that Devī’s fingers stem from the light of the Vasus; (Gal. II. 15). प्राजापत्येन तेजसा is translated “Out of the fire of the Brahmin creators and patriarchs,” while पावक denotes Agni here (II. 16). In the following verse, शिवा is the Goddess (Thea). Agrawala’s explanatory and transitional sentence (II. 19a) : ततो देवा ददुस्तस्यै स्वानि स्वान्यायुधानि च “Then the gods gave her each his own weapon” is omitted by Gal. (and also in SJ.’s version). Instead of using the appellatives पिनाकधृक् = “Pinakawielder” (Ag. 19) Galanos simply calls the god “Śiva” and instead of Kṛṣṇa uses Viṣṇu (Gal. II. 19). Indra, first called “lord of the devas” and then सहस्राक्ष “the one with a thousand eyes,” is simply mentioned by his main name (Gal. II. 21); (also SJ. II. 22 ignores the second epithet). Yama’s “dead dealing rod” कालदण्ड is simply called “Kāla’s rod” without any further explanation, as are Brahmā’s gifts “Akṣamālā” and “Kamaṇḍalu,” the string of beads and the water-rot, objects with rather ominous connotations. (Gal. II. 22). In II, 24 Galanos has the milky ocean, the galaxy, give the Goddess only a string of pearls and two non-aging and non-decaying garments; he does not mention : a divine crest-jewel, a pair of ear-rings, bracelets, a brilliant half-moon ornament, armlets for all arms, a pair of shining anklets, a matchless necklace

and excellent rings for all fingers. (Ag. II. 24-26; SJ. II. 25-29) Galanos leaves that to Viśvakarman (II. 25-6) who in the subsequent verse furnishes her with the shining axe and other weapons. The mountain हिमवान् is called "Himaos" (II. 29) and वनाधिप "the Lord of Wealth" simply Kubera.

The boisterous laugh of the Goddess is translated by the onomatopoeic word *kagchasma*, "loud, derisive laughter" (II. 31). मुनयः the sages, or Ṛṣis, are called "Saintly Brahmins" (II. 34). Instead of "three worlds" for त्रैलोक्य Gal. (II. 35) uses *Pan* (= "Universe"), but two verses below (II. 37) he uses (for लोकत्रय) "the threefold Cosmos," which is filled with her splendour; although the text describes how the Goddess accomplishes it (by scraping the sky with her pointed diadem, by bending the earth with her foot-step and by shaking the netherworld with the twang of her bowstring—Galanos' order is different) the Greek text is not very clear on this. II. 40 mentions the fourfold army commanded by "Samaras" (= Cāmara), but does not explain that "four-fold" means comprised of cavalry, charioteers, elephant-soldiers and foot-soldiers, a fact which would have been of some interest to Galanos' European contemporaries. The weapons Galanos mentions are mostly of Homeric vintage; only one (II. 47: *rhomphaia* = a scimitar used by the Turks and Arabs) is a foreign (Thracian ?) word, introduced by Plutarch and then designating Goliath's sword in Biblical Greek. In II. 58 the trident (*triaina*) usually associated with Neptune is mentioned.

A major divergence from SJ.'s Sanskrit-English versions (II. 60) and from Ag.'s English translation (II. 59) is found in Galanos' verse II. 59; while the latter translates : "Other giants, enemies of the gods, when rushing toward the Goddess like falcons toward the bird (in translit. Greek : "*hōs hierakes ep' ornin....*") gave up their ghosts on the field of battle, their entire bodies riddled with many arrows." SJ.'s translation of शल्यानुकारिणः "resembling porcupines" appears correct, but Ag.'s Sanskrit version has इयेनानुकारिणः resembling falcons" which is obviously an error, since he translates the word as "resembling porcupines".

Chapter III. At the beginning of the third chapter, there is one of the rare notes Galanos provided. III. 2 reads : ' [The great Titan]

rained showers of arrows on the Goddess, just as the cloud showers rain on Meru" which is explained : "Golden is Mount Meru (spelled 'Meroe'), golden also the Goddess; the cloud is black, and black also the Titan."

The Goddess' awe-inspiring roar हुंकार (Gal., Ag. III. 11) is in Galanos' translation a rather disappointing "A",¹⁶ yet it breaks the spear hurled at her. Two verses later, the lion is depicted as "boxing and wrestling on the elephant's midhead." As in 10 (Ag. III. 10; SJ. III. 11) where Cāmara's epithet त्रिदशार्दन "tormenter of the thirty-three (gods)" is omitted, Galanos also leaves out the proper name Parameśvarī (III. 18, Ag. *ibid.*; SJ. III. 19) and calls her "that three-eyed great lady," using the trident.

Chapter IV. In chapter IV. 3 Galanos adds to the names of gods mentioned in Ag. IV. 3 and SJ. IV. 4 (Bhagavān Viṣṇu, Brahmā and Hara) Śeṣa—the serpent king who is also referred to as "ananta"—; instead of Hara, Galanos uses the more familiar form Śiva, and he has the goddess asked to concentrate her mind on "the salvation (*soteria*) of this cosmos," a rather Christian concept which finds an echo in Galanos' translation of मुक्तिहेतु as "reason for immortality" (*aitia...tes athanasias*) and "those in quest of immortality" in IV. 8 (Ag. IV. 8; SJ. IV. 9). The sixth verse was greatly simplified by Galanos : "You are the beginning, and the boundless and unalterable matter. Even though you have three qualities, you are nevertheless without quality and without passion; and you are incomprehensible even to Viṣṇu and Śiva. You are the support of all, and the practical and material cause of all beings." When compared with the original Sanskrit text and the somewhat confusing Ag. (IV. 6) and SJ. (VI. 7) renditions, the Galanos version is almost a Western interpretation.

In addition to what was said above in regard to "salvation" and "immortality [of the soul]" there are, in Gal. IV. 8-9 (same in Ag.; SJ. 9-10) two more Judaeo-Christian concepts which, it would seem, appear by design: "*Sophia*" for विद्या and "*logos*" for शब्द. Both terms could have been expressed in many other ways (*e. g.* vidyā = *to eidenai, episteme, gnosis phronesis, sophrosyne*; śabda = *lexis*,

16. An exclamation expressing pity, envy, contempt...also in reproofs and warnings (Liddle & Scott, *Greek-English Lexicon* I, 1).

rhema, mythos). Sophia, first recognized as an attribute of God, was later identified with the Spirit of God.¹⁷ As to logos, we need mention only the opening verse of the gospel according to St. John: "In the beginning was the Word (logos), and the Word was with God, and the Word was God."

To give an example of Galanos' Greek rendition a few verses of chapter IV are translated here almost *verbatim* :

8. You, O Goddess, are that divine and supreme Wisdom (*Sophia*) which is the cause of immortality and so hard to attain. You become accessible to those holy Brahmins desirous of immortality, through hardy (Spartan-like) training and asceticism, to those who mortify their senses and concentrate their minds on things divine and live their lives without passions.
 9. You are the Word (*Logos*) itself, you are the source of the pure Ṛg—and Yajurvedas and of the Sāmaveda which is praised as being melodious and clear-toned (*ligyros*). You are the ineffable (*thespesia*) Triad of the Vedas. You are the entire organization and guidance in the conflict and life of the Cosmos. You are the deliverer from the terrors of the Cosmos.
 10. You, O Goddess, are Sarasvatī herself. (omitted here : "by whom the essence of all scriptures is compre-
-
17. It would be tempting to suggest that G. might reflect here on Philo's (of Alexandria, a Jewish Hellenist 25 B. C.—40 A. D.) writings in whose allegorical commentary on the Old Testamental *Genesis*, biblical figures become virtues personified (in the sense of the "prakṛtis"). Logos the nature of which is Sophia, very much in concert with the concept of the Stoics, becomes the saviour and guides those who engage in Spartan-like training (Gal. : skleragogia), asceticism—like the munis or G. 's "holy Brahmins"—and in ecstasy, to God. See : *Paulys Realencyclopädie der class. Altertumswissenschaft* XX, 1 (1941), 1—50. Unfortunately Philo's works are not listed in I. Sakkeliou's 'The Patmian Library (Athens, 1890; also Charles Diehl "Le trésor et la bibliothèque de Patmos au commencement du 13e siècle", *Byzant. Zeitschrift* I (1892), 488—525 does not mention Philo. (The island of Patmos where G. had his ecclesiastic training would have been the most likely place for him to learn about Philo who never was a favorite of Christian theologians.)

hended"). You are the only boat across the endless ocean of this Cosmos. You are Śrī who lives in the heart of Viṣṇu (instead of : "Kaiṭabha's foe"). You are Gaurī who is half of Śiva's (instead of "moon-crested") body.

11. It was so strange that, although the Titan (instead of : Asura Mahiṣa) saw your face which was cheerful and resplendent and beaming like the translucent moon, like pure gold, that, nevertheless, the Titan swayed by anger would have wanted to strike it.
12. But it was even stranger that the Titan did not take flight immediately when he saw your face then, full of wrath, with lowered eyebrows, and red like the just now rising moon. For, who is able to breathe life when he has seen the enraged god of death ?
13. May you be gracious, O Goddess : for when you are cheerful, you create life at once. But when angry, you destroy whole nations and tribes. This has become known already from the fact that the immense army of the giant Mahiṣa perished.

Galanos' translation of IV. 19 is different from Ag. 's, and agrees with S.J. 's (IV. 20) : "The eyes of the Titans were not blinded by the sparkling lustre" of the various weapons borne by Durgā.... "since they also beheld your immortal face on the forehead of which there lies also the immortal half-moon" (giving out cool rays). In IV. 20 Agrawala leaves about half of the Sanskrit text untranslated; S.J. 's full version (IV. 21) is also translated by Galanos : ("For it is your intention, O Goddess, to make the works of the evil-doers undone). Your beautiful form is inconceivable (*akatanoeitos*) and incomparable (*asygkritos*). Your power is the destruction of the Titans. But you also show pity towards enemies."

"Nandana's grove" (Ag. IV. 27; S.J. 29) is simply translated as "the paradise of Indra" (Gal. IV. 27), and also the various names of the Goddess are again simplified : (31) Maheśvarī is expressed as "Great Ruler" (*megale Despoina*), (32) Ambikā who is called "the one with a resplendent face" (*o aglaoprosope*) is omitted. (33) Bhadrakālī is "the beautiful Goddess" (*kale thea*). There is a slight

divergence in the last two Galanos verses of chapter IV, when compared with Ag.'s and S.J.'s versions. "Now, listen, how again in the body of Gaurī she became the benefactress of the gods by the deaths of Śumbha and Niśumbha, the chiefs of the evil Titans, and through the salvation of the human race and of the gods. For I will tell you everything how this came about."

Chapter V. In chapter V, there is a slight difference in the distribution of verses and Galanos' count does not coincide with that of Agrawala's edition. The last verse (Gal. 5; Ag. 6; S.J. 7) contains an interesting translation of Viṣṇumāyā = "the material and creative power of Viṣṇu" (*ten hyliken kai poietiken dynamin toy Visnoy*) which they praised. (Ag. translates प्रतुष्टुः as the goods "stood before her!") In the following verse "Reverence to the great and good Goddess! Reverence forever to the brilliant matter (*tei aglaai Hylei*)...." the latter expression is Galanos' translation of प्रकृत्यै भद्रायै, what S.J. V. 9 calls, "the primordial cause and sustaining power". Dhātrī, in the following verse, is ingeniously translated by Galanos as *Tithene* ("nurse" in Homer's *Iliad* 6, 389; rarely "mother") which is formed from the same Indo-European root* *dhe*. The Greek version of Ag. V, 9 and S.J. 11 is somewhat shorter: "We do reverence to the one who is welfare herself and prosperity as well as perfection of those who worship her, who is the force of the Titans and the good fortune of Kings."¹⁸

A note from the editor (p. 29) states that verse V. 9 (= Ag. 10, S.J. 12) is missing in G.'s manuscript. This verse¹⁹ is the fourth in the sequence of altogether thirty-six verses in which the gods proclaim and extol the virtues and qualities, practical and spiritual, of the Great Goddess. In general, Galanos follows the sequence; except that he omits one verse (Ag. V. 27; S.J. 59-61) where it is said that the Goddess "abides in all beings in the form of activity

18. Perhaps a mistake in the Greek translation, which should read: "to the *nairṭi* (i. e. misfortune) and *lakṣmī*" (i. e. good fortune) of Kings. The Greek text has an explanatory note: "Sarvane is a paronym for Sarva's wife, i. e. Viṣṇu's".

19. To Durgā who guides us in difficult situations, who is the essence and procreator of all things, who is knowledge (Ag. : Fame) who is blue-black as well as smoke-like (in complexion).

(वृत्तिरूपेण)”. He also uses three expressions for “all beings”²⁰. Galanos also leaves out शान्तिरूपेण (Ag. V. 23; SJ. 47-49) “in the form of peace”, but adds a new quality in V. 27 (*eysplagchnia* = goodness of heart).

Footnotes in the following narrative of the Ṛṣi (Greek: *Hosios*) explain that the gods did not know that the woman who came here to bathe in the waters of the Ganges was not an ordinary woman, but the Goddess Pārvatī herself. Galanos also points out that the poet “etymologizes” the word *Kossa*, (कोश) meaning “*thylax*” = sheath, box, frame, from which “*Kausiki*” is formed. Kubera’s treasure महापद्म is circumscribed as “this great and inexhaustible treasure” (Gal. V. 48; Ag. 49; SJ. 96). Prajāpati’s chariot in the following verse is described as having formerly belonged to the “progenitor and patriarch Dakṣa” (who is not always identical with Prajāpati). In V. 50 (Ag. 51; SJ. 98) Galanos names “the spearhead of death”, i. e. Utkrantidā, and adds *thanatephoros* “carrying death” and specifies सलिलराजस्य as “*Hydromedontos Varouna*” (of the water-king Varuṇa). In the following verse, Agni’s garments are purified by fire, which is different from Ag. 52, where they do not catch fire. Sugrīva (Gal. 53; Ag. 54; SJ. 101) is called “*apostolos*”, although there are Greek words with less Christian connotations (e. g. *pompōs*, *metaggelos*). Galanos mentions “*Outsaisrava*” (Uccaiṣravas in V. 60; Ag. 61; SJ. 110), but in the following verse only the Gandharvas appear by name; the Nāgas are called only “subterranean snakes.”

Chapter VI.-VII. There are hardly any differences in the translations of Chapter VI by Galanos and by Ag. and SJ., except for the infinitely greater empathy shown in Galanos’ satirical portrayal of the teasing Goddess and her reported pronouncements, starting with V. 66 (Ag. 67; SJ. 117) until the enemies “beheld her, the smiling²¹ Goddess, sitting upon the

20. Gal. V. 11 : *en hapasi tois oysi*; “beings”, called *hyle* (“matter”). 12—20 : (*en*).... *hapasi tois empsychois*; “with a soul” called *aisthesis* (“perception”). 21—31 : (*en*).... *hapasi tois anthropois*; “human beings”.

21. Galanos uses rare verb forms as they appear in similar situations in the *Iliad* I, 490 (where Leto smilingly “*meidiosan*” punishes Artemis) and in Aristophanes’ comedies. Cf. Horace’s *Satires* I, 1, 24 : *Quamquam ridentem dicere verum* = “To tell the truth, yet with a smile”. Also cp. *Od.* XX, 301 about “Sardonic smile”.

Lion on the towering golden peak of the King of the Himalayan mountain". (Gal. VII. 2; Ag. 2; SJ. 3). When she finally becomes angry and takes on the form terrible to behold, which is called *Kale*, there is a note by Galanos: "*Kale*, i. e. Black is the symbol of death." Another note in VII. 17 (Ag. 17; SJ. 18) tells the reader that (the numerous disks disappearing in Kālī's mouth looked like numerous solar orbs disappearing into the midst of a cloud) "the cloud is black; and black is also Kālī's body". Kālī, holding Caṇḍa's head and Muṇḍa's body in her hands, goes to Kauṣikī (Gal. VII. 22), not to Caṇḍikā (Ag. 22; SJ. 23); also in VIII. 10 (Ag. 10; SJ. 11) Kauṣikī appears instead of Caṇḍikā.

Chapter VIII. When the battle begins in earnest, the so-called "superior devas"—Brahmā, Śiva, Viṣṇu, Indra and (Ag. VIII, 12: Kārttikeya; SJ. 13 : Guha) Skanda (Gal. 11)—offer their *śaktis* (in Galanos' translation: *dynamis*=strength) to the Goddess Kauṣikī (in Ag. and SJ. : Caṇḍikā). "The strength of Brahmā or, as it is called : Brahmānī, came seated on a divine chariot harnessed to swans, and held in her hands the Akṣasūtra and the Kamaṇḍalu." (Gal. VIII. 14). There are notes which explain that "Aksasoutra is the name of string of pearls (*Kombologion*) and Kamandalou is the waterjar (*prochoe*); they are the characteristic signs of Brahmā; his vehicle is the swan, his chariot yoked to swans." Also to the next verses, (Gal. VIII. 16-18; Ag. 15-17; SJ. 15-17) describing in detail the "*dynamis*" of Śiva, Kumāra and Viṣṇu, notes are affixed which repeat the content of the self-explanatory verses : "The vehicle of Śiva is the bull (*tayros*); the adornments on her wrists worn like bracelets, and on her neck like a collar are snakes, and the half-moon on her forehead; her weapon is the trident".—"Skanda (s) who is the God of war, is also called Koumara (s); his vehicle is the peacock (*taos*), his weapon is the spear." And Vaiṣṇavī, the "*dynamis*," of Viṣṇu is seated on the Garuḍa, which is explained : "Viṣṇu's vehicle is the Garouda (s)."²² वाराही and नारसिंही (VIII. 18; 19) are circumscribed each as "*dynamis*" of Viṣṇu, having then assumed the incomparable

22. It is difficult to believe that Galanos would have written such insignificant repetitive notes. The *akṣamālā* and *kamaṇḍalu* in Gal. II. 22 (Ag., SJ. 23) were not explained. It is impossible at present to check the Athenian manuscript, but it may be safely assumed that the editor provided at least these particular notes.

(*aneikaston*) bodily form of a boar, and that of a lion-man, scattering the stars by the violent shaking of the mane. Aindrī does not sit on the lord of elephants, hers is white or shining, and Kauśikī emitted a bark, like (really : *meta*=with) many other hyenas or jackals (*kynolykos*). Śiva, whose dark-coloured matted locks are not mentioned by Galanos (VIII. 23) is asked by the Goddess to go as her envoy (*presbys*) to the Asuras. Thus दूत, in the case of the Asura Sugrīva (Gal. VI. 53; Ag. 54; S.J. 102) is translated as "*apostolos*"=messenger, or in an ironic allusion to the Christian sense : "someone to bring the good spell", while "*presbys*" means 'an elder preferred to power and dignity.' In VIII. 38-39, 44, 49 (Ag. *ibid.*; S.J. 39-40, 45, 50) Galanos circumscribes the मातृगण as "army formation of the Goddesses" (*tagmata ton Theainon*) and the name of Raktabīja which appears there, is explained in a note : "Raktabejas=blood seed; this is the way the poet gives the etymology of the word." Like Agrawala, Galanos abstains from ridiculing the fearridden devas which it would seem is clearly intended here :चण्डिका प्राहसत्स्वरा (Ag. 52; S.J. 53).²³ He has Kauśikī, raising the din of war (*pole-moklonos*) and seeing the despondent Gods, tell Kālī to open her mouth wide...(Gal. 52). The very last verse of the tenth chapter, where the erstwhile frightened gods now derive great pleasure from the fall of bloodless Raktabīja, attests once more to a very disdainful portrayal of them and of their mātṛkās which are only their extensions : they dance, driven to frenzy by the blood (which by the way is not there, since all of it has been swallowed by Cāmuṇḍā). Galanos significantly chooses the passive perfect participle of the verb *bakcheyo* (to express मदीद्धत; "puffed up with pride, haughty"²⁴), an allusion to the secret mysteries of Dionysos in ancient Athens, known in Rome as Bacchanalia. Although these rites have much in common with Tantric practices, Galano's choice of "*bebakcheymenos toi haimati*" (like Bacchus driven to frenzy by blood) is certainly

23. Ag. VIII. 52 : "Seeing the gods dejected, Caṇḍikā exclaimed impetuously and spoke to Kālī...." But she actually laughed at them. It would seem that तान् विषण्णान् सुरान् is also a rather contemptuous and disdainful expression.

24. C. Cappeller, *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary* (Strassburg, 1891) p. 392.

not complimentary, but attests to his insight into shared mythological relationship.²⁵

Chapter IX. The "*okta selenos aspīs toy Soymbba*" (not of Nisumbha as in Ag. 10; S.J. 12) is described in a note as "moonfaced ornaments made of bronze or gold, fixed on the shield." But two verses later (IX. 12) Galanos has Nisumbha (not identified as Dānava) attack the Goddess again who crushes his dart with the blow of her fist (*pagmes*)²⁶. Galanos indicates that Nisumbha falls because he has become unconscious (*ek leipothymias*) in IX. 15 [where the Sanskrit text and the English translation just say that "he fell to ground." (Ag. 15; S.J. 17) Here only in verse 27 (S.J. 29) does the reader realize that, when Nisumbha regains consciousness]. The Goddess' clanging of the bell "destroys the braveness and pride of the entire army of the Titans", (Gal. 18), and in the following verse "the lion emitted a roar louder than that of a rutting (or maddened) elephant, and this sound filled heaven and earth and all (instead of "ten") directions". Ag. 's and S.J.'s English renditions (IX. 19, 21 resp.) are more precise, at least according to their Sanskrit texts: "there the lion's roar made the elephants give up their violent rut". When Kālī strikes the earth with both her hands, the noise she makes drowns out all the "previous sounds" which are specified in a note: "that made by the conch, by the sounds of the bow string, of the bell, and those made by the lion's roaring." (Gal. 20) This note seems somewhat superfluous, particularly when the term Śivadūti (IX. 21; Ag. *ibid.*; S.J. 23) is not explained. We remember that the Goddess sent Śiva as her *dūta* to the Asuras (VIII. 23; S.J. 24) whence her name which is first used in VIII. 37; S.J. 38. (She laughs violently, the Asuras fall and are devoured by her.)

25. Dionysos, also known as Bacchus, Bromios, Iacchus, was a son of Zeus, and visited, according to the legend, Asia and Africa. For details, cp. *Larousse Encyclopedia of Mythology* (New York, 1960) pp. 178—182. Originally, only female initiates had access to these fertility rites, at which human and later on merely animal sacrifices were offered. There were, reportedly, sexual orgies and debaucheries. Nonnos, a Greek poet and resident of Egypt (5th cent. A. D.) wrote a long, highly polished epic about these practices, *Dionysiaca* (ed. Kochly, Leipzig, 1858) which is one of our chief sources of knowledge.

26. Obviously a printer's mistake for pygme "fist" (ei, oi. eta, iota and ypsilon are all pronounced as long i in Modern Greek).

"Śivadūti" appears in verses IX. 21 (SJ. 23); 35, 39, (SJ. 37, 41) and XI. 19 (SJ. 21) always in situations where the epithet would not suggest the origin of the name. It would seem that Galanos intended to spell out the might of Kauśikī (Ambikā) and the indignities to which the gods were subjected when, in IX, 22 (Ag. *ibid.*, SJ. 24) he translates : "Kauśikī" forcefully shouted : 'stop, stop, you evildoer !...the gods staying in the heavens, screamed : 'Victory victory to you'.²⁷ Gal. 28 has "the leader of the Titans, having become ten thousand-armed" (instead of the Danuja-Lord [SJ. 30], son of Diti envelop the Goddess Kauśikī with "just as many disks," and calls the tormentor or "afflictor" of the gods (Ag. 31, SJ. 31) simply "anti-god" (*antitheos*). The sanctified water sprinkled by Brahmāṇī with the recitation of mantras (*met' epoides*) caused others to be chased away (Gal. 36), or Ag. 35 : to be "finished".

Chapter X. Śumbha's slain brother is simply characterized as *homopnoun* ("of kindred spirit") (Gal. X. 1). When accused of fighting with the strength of others, Devī, ignoring the trembling (Aryan) gods, says that these (goddesses) are "forms of myself" मद्भिभूतयः, Greek : *aporrhōiai* = "flowing off, afflux, emanations") while all the gods and the Titans or Asuras are looking on, a terrible fight begins. The Goddess by simply uttering the हुंकार again translated by "A" (Gal. X. 9)—easily (*eymaros*) destroys the missiles. There is a note in regard to Śumbha's "shield which shone like the ray-throwing sun : Golden was the shield like the red (and gold) sun." (Gal. 13) When the Goddess is lifted high up by the Asura, she fights even there निराधारा (Ag. 18, SJ. 22) "without any support", evidently meaning : no gods (who restricted themselves to cheering only) or mātrkās assisted her. But Galanos (X. 18) adds "*podon*" "without the support of her feet," i. e. floating, and this awesome battle "fills

27. The first verb, *anekraxe* "she cried out, lifted up her voice" as in Old Testament, Judges 7, 20, said of warriors ready to attack"...and they cried : The Sword of the Lord..." For the shouting of the gods, Galanos used *ekraygasan* "they barked, croaked", when used of man, as in the Greek version St. John 18, 40 : [When Pilate asked the Jewish rabble if they wanted him to release Jesus] "Then *cried* they all again, saying, Not this man, but Barabbas". Galano's choice of words was quite conscious; he could have used expressions far more current, like *boao*, *anaboao*, *anaphonso*, *phtheggomai*, *anorthiazō* (most of these expressions contain an element of pleading for help).

the gods in the sky and the holy Brahmins [instead of 'Siddhas and Munis'] with astonishment.

The last two Galanos verses show a slight divergence in the sequence of manifestations of joy over the slaying of the Asura leader. They read in translation :

26. The heavenly (creatures) then
breathed calmly. The sun became
bright and beautiful (*kalliphegges*).
The fire burned peacefully (*hesychos*).
The cries for help (*boai*) from all
parts of the world had ceased.
27. When this one (i. e. Titan) had
been removed, the Gods all together
rejoiced greatly from their hearts.
The Gandharvas sang sweetly. Others
of them sounded musical instruments,
and the Apsaras danced.

Chapter XI. While the Sanskrit text mentions the Kātyāyanī form of Devī, Galanos simplifies the name again and calls her "that Goddess". For the first time, the god Agni is described in a note, which does not sound authentic : "Agnis is called the God of Fire, and the fire itself. He is also the chief deity (*ephoros*) and the organ of the voice (*phonelikoy*)". (p. 55). Instead of "Mother of the universe" (Ag. XI. 2; S.J. 3) Galanos has the unusual expression *Pantanassa* ("Ruler of All")²⁸ who is also the "ruler of all things animate and inanimate" (*empsychon, apsychon*). Instead of "invincible valour" (Ag. 3; S.J. 4)²⁹ Galanos (3) has "unsurpassed in strength" (*anhypereblete ten dynamin*) and "by you all this is being nourished and its thirst quenched". XI. 4 again has "*megale Hyle* ("important matter") for माया, and *paranoia* is being brought to the entire world "by this

28. "Anassa", somewhat rare in Epic poetry (Od. 3,380; 6,175), more common in (lyrical) poetry; is usually reserved for prayers to the Goddess Athena. Following Patristic usage, Galanos employs here the analytic form : *hileos eso, Pantanassa*. ("Be gracious, Queen") instead of Homeric "*anass' hilethi*" (perfect imperative form of *hilemi*.)

29. Ag. XI, 3b : "By thee, who existeth in the form of water, all this Universe is filled. O thou inviolable in the valour.

your *Hyle*, O Goddess. When you become well disposed, you are the reason for redemption". The Greek word "*lytrosis*" is almost exclusively used in Christian writings : "salvation, ransoming, redemption". Gal. XI. 5 (Ag. *ibid*., SJ.6) seems to be based on a somewhat different Sanskrit version. In translation it reads :

XI. 5 You, O Goddess, are the very image of knowledge and science.

You are the every one of the beautiful and august women in the Cosmos. Of you alone O Goddess, the universe is full. You are every word (*logos*) in the Veda, and in other books, [every word] which is fitting for the composition of a song in praise. What then could there be a song in praise of you ?

6. Since you are a Goddess, about whose secret the entire world has been informed (*diathryllomene*) that you are everything, and that you have given (us) heaven and immortality (*athanasia* = मुक्ति) what fitting words could there be to proclaim you by hymns ?

Also in verse 7, the expression "heaven and immortality" is used by Galanos to translate स्वर्गपवर्ग, while Ag. 6, 7 uses "svarga/heaven and final emancipation from existence"; SJ. 7, 8 translates "enjoyment" (for svarga) and "liberation" (for both *mukti* and *apavarga*). Verse XI. 8 in Greek is far less precise than the Sanskrit text (as presented by Ag., and SJ. X, 9) :

8. O Nārāyaṇī, the protectress of change in everything in the sense of time, and the power behind the destruction of the universe, reverence is to be paid to you.

Also XI. 9 seems to be somewhat simplified :

9. O, better than all good (people), illustrious accomplisher of all desires, the refuge to be wished for, three-eyed (for Tryambakā) Gaurī, reverence etc.

SJ. XI. 11 translates गुणाक्षये गुणामये as "You are the substratum and embodiment of the three *guṇas*", Galanos' (XI. 10) translation : "You holder of virtues, triad of qualities," is closer to Ag. (*ibid*) "abode of good qualities, who consists of good qualities". Galanos' "triad" is a half-hearted attempt at an interpretation, but a note to that effect is again lacking. (Cp. Ag., p. 214. In XI. 12 there is no indication that "the water which you sprinkle

From the pitcher" is anything special (*i. e.* dipped in Kuśa grass) but a note for XI. 14 (Ag. *ibid.*, SJ. 15) explains, that "Kaumārī is the force (*dynamis*) of Kumāra who is Skanda (s). His vehicle is the peacock, his standard the rooster. According to mythology a certain Titan in the form of a rooster was pierced by Skanda's spear, who holding high the spear with the pierced rooster strutted jubilantly in a procession". A more useful note, but rather terse for the Greek reader is the identification of one of the chief leaders of the Daityas mentioned in XI. 17 : the note says simply : "*hiraṇyakaśipu*". Like SJ. (XI. 21), Galanos leaves out "O Cāmuṇḍā, who grindest shaven heads", a sentence added by Ag. XI. 20 (probably because muṇḍa means 'bald'). In the following verse where Lakṣmī is being praised as, among other virtues, being nourishment (वृद्धि : *rhostike dynamis* = fortifying power), Mahārātri and Svadhā remain untranslated, but महास्रविद्या (Ag. 21; SJ. 22 : 'Great Illusion') is expressed as "great ignorance", and in verse 22 the sequence of the Goddess' qualities is : "O Intelligence, O Sarasvatī, O Chosen one, O Triad of Qualities, O Everlasting One", and an incomplete enumeration when compared to the Ag. and SJ. texts (22, 23 resp.). In the case of Gal. XI. 23 where the Sanskrit text used by Ag. contains an additional verse, Galanos' translation follows SJ. (24) :

23. O Goddess, ruler over everything, you are everything and almighty, save us from dangers.....

Also in the following verse where Ag. XI. 25 has पातु नः सर्व-भीतिभ्यः "May [thy countenance] guard us from all created things!" while SJ. 25 has सर्वभूतेभ्यः from all fears".³⁰ Galanos (24) shows "from all danger", as he does in XI. 25 where the triad should protect us from danger. The bell of the next verse "should protect us from evil, as the mother would (protect) her children" (26). The Goddess has kept her name Kātyāyanī (24), but for

30. भीति means "fear, danger" भूत = "being". Confusion reigns supreme here : First Ag. translates भीति as "created thing" and SJ. translates भूत as "fear", *i. e.*, both are wrong in their translations. Then, in the following verse where in both Sanskrit texts भीति appears, they both use "fear" correctly.

Bhadrakālī (27; Ag. 26; SJ. 26) Galanos uses the Greek adjectival form *O deimalea* "O fearsome one". Gal. 28 adds to "those who set their hopes on you, become a refuge for others" refuge and salvation (*soteria*) for others, also in 33. There are significant changes and simplification in the Greek version of verse XI. 30 "In regard to the Vedas, to scientific knowledge (*episteme*), to cognition (*gnosis*) of essence, and to every practical aspect of the law, who but you makes the universe steer into trouble (*prospatheia*) as if into absolutely dark chaos".³¹ This Greek verse has an accompanying note which paraphrases and elucidates the original translation: "This implies the recitation of the Vedas, as well as the act of acquiring knowledge, scientific knowledge, the cognition of essence, all the practical aspects of law, of sacrifice, fasting and prayer. Nevertheless, the universe (*kosmos*), because of your Māyā (*Hyle*) is made to stray into upheaval, as if into the darkest labyrinth". If this explanatory note was indeed written by Galanos, which cannot be ascertained, his original Sanskrit text must have been at variance with that of Ag. and SJ., since the Galanos translation, even when read with the note, is different, if not incomplete.

In Verse 33, the Greek simplifies calamities "which have sprung from the maturing of portents" (Ag., SJ. 34) to "calamities which have arisen because of the sins". In response to the Goddess' promise of a boon, the gods ask, in the translated Greek version (XI, 36): "O Queen of all, effect the removal of all evils from the three worlds and, in the same manner, the destruction of all our enemies".³²

The time predicted by the Goddess, in which the two Asuras, Śumbha and Niśumbha, will be born, the twenty-eighth Yuga, is translated by Galanos (XI. 37) as: "Towards the end of the twenty-eighth *Tetraktys* of the *Aeons*, in the dynasty of Manu, which

31. Cp. SJ. 31: "Who is there except you in the sciences, in the scriptures, and in the Vedic sayings that light the lamp of discrimination? (Still) you cause this universe to whirl about again and again within the dense darkness of the depths of attachment."

32. Ag. XI, 37: "...we ask for the pacification of all the afflictions of the three worlds."

is to be called Vaivasvata".³³ In Verse XI. 44 (Ag. 45; SJ. 48) which is frequently cited as proof and "one very clear example of plant theophany" in the cult of the (pre-Aryan) Indian goddess, Durgā,³⁴ Galanos translates the name Śākambharī into Greek *Lachanotrophos* = "bearer of vegetables", but the name of the Asura who causes the drought and is slain by the Goddess is not Durgama (Ag. 46; SJ. 49), but in transliteration *Doyrgas*; she will then be known as Goddess (*Thea*) *Doyrga*. She will kill the Rākṣasas (*daimonas*) to ensure the safety of the saints and ascetics (instead of "Munis" : XI. 46) and will then be known as the Terrible Goddess (Bhīmā-Devī = *Phrikte Thea*); to kill the evil-doer, the Titan Aruṇa, she will "metamorphose" herself into a swarm of bees (*eis esmon Bombylion*) and be then known as *Bombylia* (आमरी), and the note explains, unnecessarily again: "which is a swarm of bees". In the last verse (XI. 50) Galanos leaves out "then I shall become incarnate again"; "Thus, whenever terrible things are wrought by the Titans (instead of the Dānavas) then I shall effect the destruction of the bitterest enemies".

Chapter XII. माहात्म्यमुत्तमम् (Ag. 3; SJ. 4) is translated as *ex-hairetos Megalourgia* (Gal. 3: "choice achievement, or magnificence") likewise in the following verses, e.g. 6: where it is called "the dwelling place of good fortune" परं स्वस्त्ययनं महत् (Ag. 6; SJ. 7). Verse 7 (Ag. *ibid.*; SJ. 8) is more specific than the Sanskrit text, which speaks only of "the threefold natural calamities". The Greek text when translated says: "This *Megalourgia* stops all the bad things, which arise from the great plague (*loime*) and the terrible things (which come) from God, from man, and from the body". A note is added which says: "The bad things stemming from the body are the diseases; from man: murder, captivity, robbery; from God: floods, droughts, dearth, firestorms, and sundry things". In

33. *Tetraktys*, a term coined by Pythagoras is the "name for the sum of the first four numbers, i. e. 10 (= 1 + 2 + 3 + 4)"; also "the four terms (6:8:9:10) of the proportion corresponding to the chief musical intervals". (See Liddell & Scott, *Greek-English Lexicon II*, 1781.) The reason why Galanos chose this obscure term is unknown, unless obfuscation—in conjunction with the term "aeons"—was the very purpose of his choice of words.

34. M. Eliade, *Patterns in Comparative Religion*, Meridian Book No. 155 (Cleveland, N. Y. 1963), p. 280.

verse XII. 8 Galanos does not translate वायतने मम (Ag. *ibid.*, SJ. 9) as "in my shrine" but rather "In whose house this is recited continuously, as is proper I will always be present there". Also the next verse differs slightly: (Gal. 9) All of this must be chanted and heard, in accordance with the proper rites...." To verse 10, where the Goddess indicates that she will accept sacrifices offered not only by the initiated, but also by non-initiates, there is a note added: "Even when a person does it imperfectly because he does not know (how to do it) I shall accept it" (p. 63). While Ag. XII. 11 and SJ. 12 mention only the great annual worship during the Śarad season, Galanos has it "in the late autumn as well as in spring" (*Katā to phthinoporon kai kata to ear*). A new word appears here (XII, 13, 14, 15, 18; XIII. 1) for माहात्म्य *Megaleiotes* "grandness, splendour, majesty." The propitiatory ceremony शान्तिकर्मन् (Ag. XII. 15; SJ. 16) is translated by *en pasei teletei* "in the entire ceremony".³⁵ बालग्रहाभिभूतानां—of children "seized by child-grabbing evil spirits" is translated into Greek "of children possessed by Harpies and Vampires" (*harpyiokatochon kai lamiokatochon brephon*).³⁶ A note added to this sentence, says that, according to mythology, certain female demons, who were Putanā, Dākinī, and Śākinī seize

-
35. In modern Greek, the word *he telete* means "ceremony, festival". In ancient Greek it usually refers to the Dionysian mysteries, *i. e.* the initiation rite. (Liddle & Scott, *Greek-English Lex.* II, 1770 f.)
36. *Harpyiai* were originally the goddesses of the devastating storms, symbolizing the sudden and total disappearance of men. Later they were represented as half-birds, half-maidens, and as spirits of mischief. The so-called Harpy-Monument dated about 500 B. C., now in the British Museum, shows Harpies carrying off the daughters of Pandareus (Homer, *Od.* XX. 78 ff).

Lamiai are legendary vampires represented as having the head and breast of a woman and the body of a snake. They were fond of young persons' blood, and used disguises to attract their victims. When they had sated their appetites, their form was hideous; their faces glowed like fire; their bodies were smeared with blood; and their feet appeared of iron or of lead. They were thought to be roaming through Africa and Thessaly where they waylaid unwary travellers. The *Lamiai* figured prominently in the nursery-legends of antiquity and were objects of terror to the young. Aristophanes (444-388 B. C.) mentions the *Lamiai* in his satire *The Wasps* (line 1177) a play dealing with the Athenian passion for lawsuits.

children from their births up to the age of five, and drink their blood" (p 65).

Gal. XII. 18 reads in translation :

This very grandeur of mine, when invoked becomes the force which removes all evils, which turns away the evil spirits, as well as [such things] which are responsible for the intercession [demanded of me].

While Ag. XII. 19 and S.J. 20f translate the Sanskrit passage as "This entire Māhātmya (or glorification) of mine draws a person very near to me...." Galanos' translation stresses a different aspect: XII. 19f "Just as much joy and pleasure as I derive when the whole work is chanted for me in the proper manner, I also derive from sacrifices offered to me, from flowers, from waters (*hydasi* for अर्घ्यं), from gay spectacles, all kinds of luxuries and sweet wines, offered every day in the course of a whole year". A note explains "gay spectacles" as being "choruses and musical instruments". "Luxuries (*tryphemata*) are magnificent banquets (*lamprai klinai*) as well as beautiful garments (*ta aglaa amphia*) and sweet wines (*glykasmata*)" i.e., all ingredients of and for the orgiastic Dionysiac festival. The "choros" is its chief element; Galanos' choice of rather rare words like *klinai* for banquet, *amphia* for garments is no mere coincidence.

When the Ṛṣi (Hosios) relates how भगवती चण्डिका चण्डविक्रमा disappears before the very eyes of the gods, Galanos (XII. 29) calls her *he obrimoergos ekeine Thea* "that Goddess doing strong deeds, but the word *obrimoergos* does it always in a bad sense, doing deeds of violence or wrong, especially against the gods".³⁷ Perhaps this somewhat pejorative characterization of the Goddess' deeds was not intentional.

The remaining daityas went away to Pātāla (Ag. XIII 31; S.J. 35), but Galanos marches those "Titans" to the Tartarus, as

37. Liddell & Scott, II, 1196 : *Iliad* V, 403 is cited where a variant reading exists for the word *obrimoergos*, Aristarchus' *aisyloergos* which means "doing unseemly, evil, godless things". *Op. cit.* I, 43; II, V, 403 reads in translation : "Rash man, perpetrator of violence, who does not account for his evil deeds, yet he knows well that his arrows he has angered the Gods who hold Olympus". (Said of Diomedes, Tydeus' son.)

Zeus threatened to do with the Greek gods³⁸. In keeping with the stylistic preference for active-voice constructions, Galanos translates verse 33 (Ag. 33; SJ. 37 : “By her, this universe is deluded” मोह्यते) : “Because of this Goddess all (people) in the universe lose their wits (*paranousin*). Yet she herself creates all this (universe) when entreated and pleased (*aitetheisa te kai hestheisa*) she gives divine knowledge, and prosperity”. The special term ब्रह्माण्ड *i. e.* Brahmā’s egg, is not explained, but given the feminine gender for unknown reasons : *he Brachmanda* which is ‘full of this Goddess Kālī who also becomes the All-destroyer at the end of the world (*en tei synteleiai toy aionos*, XII. 34). In verse 36, Galanos retains the antithesis Lakṣmī and Alakṣmī; a footnote explains : *eydaimonia* for the first, and *kakodaimonia* (misfortune) for the second name. In the last verse, Galanos translates as “a virtuous inclination to do good works” (*klisin agathen* for : मतिं धर्मे गतिं शुभाम्).

Chapter XIII. “The Māyā of Viṣṇu” is again translated as *he hylike dynamis* “the material force”, an expression used elsewhere and परमेश्वरी as “grand queen” (*megale despoina*), who gives man luxuries (*tryphas*), heaven and immortality (*aīhanasia* for what Ag. calls Mokṣa). [Gal. XIII. 1-3; Ag. *ibid.*; SJ. 1-5] The Ṛṣi, described as शंसितव्रत (Ag. 4; SJ. 6) is called “the all-blessed and the most self-disciplined saint” (*paneydaimon and egkratestatos*).³⁹ King and merchant then perform “austerities (*askesis* for तपस्), to have a view of the Goddess and they recite privately (*mystikos*) the hymns in the Veda directed to the Goddess (Gal. 7). The *Devīsūkta* (Ag. 6; SJ. 9) is not mentioned by its title. Their offerings, in Galanos’ version, consist of flowers, incense and fire; water is not included. The world-supporting Caṇḍikā, referred to as the “cosmos-nourishing (*kosmothrepteira*) Goddess”, appears to them, not in a visible (प्रत्यक्ष) form, (Ag. 9; SJ. 12), but bodily (*somatikos*, Gal. 10).

38. In book VIII of the *Iliad*, Zeus warns that “I shall take and hurl [any disobedient god] into murky Tartarus, far, far away, where there is the deepest abyss beneath the earth; the gates are made of iron and the threshold of bronze; it is as far beneath Hades as heaven is above earth. Then you will realize, whether and in what way I am the mightiest of all gods. (*Il. VIII, 13-16*).

39. *Paneydaimon* is a Byzantine honorary title, also used for the city of Constantinople as the centre of the Eastern Church.

The merchant, probably in anticipation of his profound wish, is called कुलनन्दन (Ag. 10; SJ. 14), but Galanos omits "the delight of your family", and calls him Vaiśya (*Baissea*, 11). The King asked for an unchangeable (*ametaptotos*) kingdom. The wise merchant, who "had contempt (*katagnous*) for all the things in the world, asks for knowledge of essence (*gnosin ton onton*),⁴⁰ which puts away the clinging of the soul to the body and its passions and self-conceit (*prospatheia* and *oiesis*).

In XIII. 15 and 18, Galanos provides the Greek equivalent of God Vivasvat and Sūrya : *Helios*, and the merchant is promised (not as in SJ. 15 : "Supreme knowledge shall be yours, for your self-realization.") "that *gnosis* will be yours for the enjoyment of immortality (*athanasia*)".

Conclusion :

As in the case of his other translations, published and unpublished, Galanos did not make an express attempt at explaining or interpreting the *Devīmāhātmya*. He simplified the text a little : he ignored the various appellatives of Hindu deities which point to events in their past or to particular qualities—something that might have confused his uninitiated Greek readers even further—and called them by their principal names. E. g. Śiva instead of "wielder of the Pinaka", the Goddess' various Sanskrit names are represented in the Greek as "Mother", "Goddess and Queen" (*Thea kai Kyria*); for Caṇḍikā he writes "Terrifying Queen" (II. 24 : *phobera Kyria*); instead of "Lord of the Thousand Eyes", Galanos simply writes "Indra" (II, 21) and for the terms munis, siddhas, ṛṣis, maharṣis he has only "holy Brahmins", the Asuras are called "Giants" or "Titans," Varuṇa and Agni "the God of the atmosphere" (*Aer*) and "The God of Fire" (*Pyr*).

When compared with the English versions of the *Devīmāhātmya* by Agrawala and Svāmī Jagadīśvarānanda, the Greek trans-

40. Implying higher, esoteric knowledge as in I Ep. Corinth. 8, 7; 10 : "However, there is that knowledge not in every man...." *gnosis* is a multifaceted word in Orthodox theology. SJ. XIII. 18 : "Then the wise merchant also, whose mind was full of dispassion for the world, chose that knowledge which removes the attachment (in the form of) 'mine' and 'I.'" The term *prospatheia* is also used for "mamatva" (I. 11) and "moha" (I. 39).

lation by Galanos shows a few divergences, but on the whole the content is the same, as can be expected. What is so radically different is the stylistic finesse which the Greek text manifests, composed by an accomplished master of his native tongue.

There may not be many biographical data on which to base a valid characterization of this Greek exile in Vārāṇasī⁴¹, but a close scrutiny of the Greek text at hand reveals a man of extra-ordinary erudition, reflection and sensitivity. These qualities, of which Ty-paldos, the editor, was very much aware, seem to have prompted him to write the long-winded introduction, about thirty-five pages which, unfortunately, has little to do with Galanos's *Devīmāhātmyam* translation.

The Greek used by him is essentially the traditional idiom in which the (Greek) Fathers of the Church wrote their voluminous treatises, and in which Galanos had received his theological training, i. e. "Patristic Greek". But this translation reveals also his background in the knowledge of antiquity and mastery of the early (Epic) and classical idioms (prose and poetry). There are many rare grammatical forms and words—mostly from Homer's epics—and it is in the Galanos' judicious and balanced choice of words that the attentive reader can sense some of the author's reflections and intentions.

There are learned allusions to the Judeo-Christian traditions which were already mentioned in our analysis of individual passages in the text: Logos, Sophia; *soteria* "salvation", *lytrosis* "redemption", *athanasia* "immortality" for mukti, *eysplagchnia* "goodness of heart", *Pantokrator* "Omnipotent", *Kyria* and *Despoina* for the Lady and Goddess, *apostolos* "messenger" versus *presbys* "envoy", *anti-theos* "anti-god", *askesis* "austerities" *hesychos* "peacefully", *mystikos* "mystically, in secret", *gnosis ton onton* "knowledge of essence". But there is no indication whatever that Galanos thought of the Goddess Kālī in terms of the mother of Jesus, Mary, who is often

41. On the tombstone of a friend who had lived in Galanos' house and was buried near Galanos' grave-site he had the following inscribed:

Sacred to the memory of Peter Federoff, a Native of Russia who died in the Prime of his Life on the 4th Jany. 1825 HO XENOS D. GALANOS HO ATHENAIOS TO XENO PETRO TO ROSSO. (Xenos meaning foreigner, in the sense of exile.)

depicted as a dark-complexioned, almost black-faced woman in traditional Byzantine art. After all, Mary, though also mystifying, does not have any of the terrifying aspects of the Goddess which are necessary to eradicate the evils in the world. In Christian theology, Mary is not the mover; she is considered only Mediatrix and Corredemptrix.

But a close examination of the Greek vocabulary also reveals the metaphysical aspects which Galanos perceived in this hymn in praise of the Great Goddess. His Greek translations for Mahāmāyā are *Megale Hyle*, for māyā *hyle*⁴², for śakti *dynamis* and for rūpa *eidos*; all these words are technical terms for the basic principles Aristotle employs when he analyzes the nature and purpose, as well as realization of the world. For the genesis of any creature "matter" (*hyle*), "actuality" (*energeia*), and "form" (*eidos*) are necessary. "Matter" merely possesses the "potential" (*dynamis*), but the "form" alone is the decisive instrument, the formative principle which leads to the realization (*entelecheia*) of the "potential" which inherently possesses this possibility: the realization of felicity (*eudaimonia*) or infelicity (*kakodaimonia*).

In Gal. IX. 22 (cp. note 27) we noted how the Goddess "shouted forcefully" (*anekraxē* like a determined warrior) while the gods, defeated, bewildered, "screamed" (*ekraygasan*, like the

42. The word *hyle* originally means: forest, woodland; also brushwood, undergrowth, firewood, timber; the stuff of which a thing is made, (probably wooden) material. Aristotle was the first to use *hyle* as a philosophical term, defined as "that which is fit to underlie origin and decay" (*to hypokeimenon geneseos kai phthoras dektikon*; Aristotle *De Generatione et Corruptione*, 320 a 2) or "that from which (something) originates": *to ex hōy gignetai* (*id. Metaphysica*, 1032 a 17). It is a passive entity or substance with inherent qualities or potentials which must be awakened and guided by an outside agency of actuality (*energeia*) and form (*eidos*). Depending on the (good or bad) quality of the outside agency, *hyle* is thus the source of chance and defect since it is subject to unpredictable outside interference with its proper intrinsic finality. In a felicitous case, the passive matter, awakened and moved by the purest form, the divine spirit (*nous*) gradually loses its original nature and finally takes on the ideal form of its erstwhile agency. See *Aristotle's Metaphysics*, Greek and Engl., Loeb's Classical Library (Cambr., Mass.; London 1947) (Book XII, pp. 123-175; also *Aristotle, De la Generation et de la Corruption, texte établi et traduit*. par Charles Mugler (Paris, 1966).

Jewish rabble demanding Christ's death). And quite often it is not clear whether the Goddess' derisive laughter (*kagchasma*) and haughty sneers are directed only toward the doomed Asuras, and not also toward the gods who are depicted in this hymn as a pitiful lot (V. 3). The Asuras will not even allow them to enjoy the customary sacrificial offerings. Dejected and helpless they pray to *Megale Hyle*⁴³, the great creator and conqueror of *Māyā*—at times referred to as *paranoia*—and place at Her disposal their potentials (*éakti=dynamis*), their characteristic weapons, ornaments and qualities, all of which they inherently possess, but cannot use. The gods now constitute an amorphous dark mass or matter (*hyle*) praying and waiting to be rescued from this all-pervasive chaos "by the material and creative force of Viṣṇu" (V. 5). Their concentration, given expression to by the appearance of a blazing light filling the entire space with brightness (II. 11) produces at first the abstract form, then the invincible concrete form of the Goddess. She personifies "the great force behind the gods" (*megale dynamis ton theon*), *energeia* and *eidos*, the active formative principles, the manifestations of which are enumerated in Gal. V. 13-34⁴⁴ : She is the eternal immovable mover *Hyle* and *energeia* (actuality) at the same time, the force of the Cosmos (*physis toy Pantos*), the great reason (*megale synesis*); She is the constructive force (*systatike dynamis*) which first awakens, then

43 Ironically, Aristotle's favorite examples for his formula (that form is the essential element in the realization of the potential capacity of matter) are man and woman. The male is the active, formative principle, while the female is the passive matter. This concept originates in observation of the biological functions, where the female ovum waits to be activated by the male sperm. The embryo is the form of the ovum, but it is also the matter from which the child form emerges; the child is the matter from which man emerges as the ultimate form. Similarly, the Goddess "incomprehensible even to Viṣṇu and Śiva" IV. 6), is matter (*hyle*), actuality (*energeia*), and form (*eidos*) at the same time.

44. The Goddess is present in all animate beings or people in the following categories: in the form (*en eidei*) of intellect, sleep, hunger, body, force, thirst, tolerance, in matters (*en onomati*) pertaining to the species, in the form of modesty, gaiety, faith, loveliness, good fortune, memory, compassion, contentment, in matters of motherhood, in the form of forgetfulness or error (*lethes*).

moulds and shapes amorphous material of which she is part to a specific figure and purpose, thus restoring order in the Cosmos, and thereby re-instating the defeated gods to their former positions—under the Goddess' guidance; they become, according to the Aristotelian scheme, an integrated and now purposeful part of Her. This scheme underlies the aim and purpose of the Sanskrit hymn as well, as can be ascertained from the advice given to the king and the merchant: "If you are in trouble, turn your prayers and devotion to Me!" And also Aristotle's theory of cyclic change (*Metaphysics*, ch. XII, VI) fits perfectly with the Goddess' prediction that there will be other upheavals (Ag., XI, 38-51). At the end of the struggle—once briefly in Gal., Ag. III. 41, and X. 25-27; XI. 1—when peace and the Goddess prevail, there are reminiscences of Aristotle's siderial "harmony" (*De Mundo*, VI 399, a, 12 f.): "They all together, singing in symphony and moving round the heaven in their measured dance, unite in one harmony whose cause is one (God) and whose end is one (cosmos): it is this harmony which entitles the All to be called "order and not disorder".

The present writer is of course not prepared to avow that the *Devīmāhātmyam* is the work of an ingenious thinker, poet and mythographer solely inspired by Aristotle's theorems and ideas; That is the impression which a close reading of Galanos' Greek translation, however implicitly, conveys. But there are other considerations (textual criticism, evaluation and analysis of our text by means of principles found in the various darśanas of Indian philosophy, problematic historical constellations, etc.) with which this very limited article cannot deal.

As was noted in the detailed analysis of the thirteen chapters, there are many words and grammatical forms taken from the Greek Epic and Classical works, a fact which is evidence of Galanos' knowledge of Greek mythology, and which prompted Typaldos to write his multifaceted introduction. But apart from the use of words like *Gigantes* and *Titanes* (for the Asuras) Galanos' *Doyrga* does not contain any direct reference either to the "Battle of the Giants" (*gigantomachia*) which is often confused with the "Battle of the Titans" (*titanomachia*)⁴⁵, or to the Minoan culture and civilization (mainly on the island of Crete) where in ancient times, religion

45. The Giants had sprung from the drops of blood of the mutilated (castrated) Uranos (i. e. Heaven). Gaia (i. e. Earth) was the mother of these human monsters who had

centered upon a goddess, or group of goddesses, whose attribute was a double axe (*labrys*), with male deities in a subordinate role.

Since Galanos did not indulge in any speculation on the origin and ultimate meaning of the *Devīmāhātmyam*, the present writer who has endeavoured to offer a philological analysis of Galanos' *Doyrga* translation will also abstain from any such attempt. But he may be permitted to mention the names of two men whose comments and translations he found very interesting and enlightening :

(1) Cavali Vankata Ramasswami, who published one of the earliest English translations of the *Devīmāhātmyam* under the title: *The Supta-sati or Chundi-pat, being a portion of the Marcundeya Purana*. Transl. from the Sanskrit into English with explanatory notes. Calcutta, 1823. (Re-edited, Bombay, 1868) This book may have been in the possession of Galanos when he translated the Sanskrit hymn into Greek.

(2) Heinrich Zimmer, *The King and the Corpse, Tales of the Soul's Conquest of Evil* (Bollingen Series XI; New York 1948) pp. 239-306 with translations from the *Kālikā Purāṇa* : "Four Episodes from the Romance of the Goddess".

id. : *Myths and Symbols in Indian Art and Civilization* (Bollingen Series VI; New York, 1946) pp. 189-221 : "The Goddess".

id. : *Maya, der indische Mythos* (Zurich, 1952) with an abridged German prose translation of the *Devīmāhātmyam*, pp. 409-421.

legs like serpents and feet formed of reptiles' heads. They attacked the gods assembled on Mount Olympus. A prophecy had predicted that only a human could rescue the gods. Heracles or (Latin) Hercules was their saviour. When he was unable to slay one of the giants' leader, the goddess Athene revealed to Hercules that the giant was invulnerable as long as he stood on the soil which had given him birth. (Cp. Ag. I. 76 where the Asuras tell Viṣṇu : "...you may slay us in a place where the earth is not covered by the flood".) At the end, gods are victorious.

According to the ancient mythographers. Hesiod and Apollodorus (both mentioned in Tylpaldos' introduction to *Doyrga*) the Titans were of the same origin as the Giants and fought against the Olympian deities. When Titans were overcome, they were hurled down into an abyss below Tartarus where the *Hekatoncheires* ("Hundred-handed") guarded them.

Also divine and semi-divine beings like Prometheus, the Sun and the Moon (*Helios*, *Selene* : Gal., Ag. I and 2; II. 5) all descendants of the Titans, are called *Titanes*.

THE WORDS अम्बक AND अम्बिका—THEIR DERIVATION AND INTERPRETATION

By

R. C. HAZBA

[ऋक्संहिताया अर्वाक्कालिकेषु वैदिकग्रन्थेषु 'अम्बक-अम्बिका'-शब्दौ रुद्र-रुद्रभगिन्योर्वाचकरूपेण विशेषणरूपेण वा प्रयुक्तौ दृश्येते; पुराणादिष्वपीमौ अनयोरर्थयोरोपलभ्येते । शब्दयोरनयोरर्थे व्युत्पत्तौ च व्याख्यातृ नामैकमत्यं नास्ति । निबन्धेऽस्मिन् लेखकेन शब्दयोरनयोरर्थव्युत्पत्तौ अधिकृत्य बहुभि-
रुदाहरणैर्विचारणा कृता, प्राचीनव्याख्यातृमतेषु दोषाश्च उद्भाविताः । विषयेऽस्मिन् क्रीष्-ग्रीफिथ्-आदि-पाश्चात्यविदुषां मतानि उद्धृतानि समीक्षितानि च । विचारप्रसंगे लेखकेन मैत्रायणीसंहितागतवाक्यविशेषस्य (१/१०/२०) शतपथब्राह्मणगतवाक्यविशेषस्य (२/६/२/९) च सदोषता स्फुटं प्रादर्शि; अम्बिकया सह रुद्रस्य यः संबन्धो वेदेऽभिहितः, तद्विषये पुष्कला चर्चाऽपि कृता ।

अम्बकशब्दार्थनिर्णयप्रसंगे लेखकेन अम्ब-अम्बि-अम्बक-अम्बिकेत्यादीनां शब्दानां व्युत्पत्तिमधिकृत्य बहु विचारितम् । लेखकमते अम्बशब्द-
स्यार्थः—गर्जकः, नादकृद्, घोषकारीति; तथैव अम्बकस्यार्थः—यः स्वभावतः शब्दं नादं गर्जनं वा करोति, कारयति वा । एवं यो दीर्घरावं गर्जनं वा करोति सोऽम्बीत्युच्यते ।

अम्बकशब्दान्तर्गत-'त्रि'-शब्देन त्रयो लोकाः (पृथिवी, अन्तरिक्षं द्यौश्च) गृह्यन्ते । अतस् अम्बकशब्दस्य द्वावर्थौ निष्पन्नौ—(१) या त्रिषु लोकेषु नदति, गर्जति, रौति वा; (२) यः लोकान् नादयति, गर्जयति, रावयति वा ।

इमावर्थौ ऋक्संहितादिसम्मतौ—इति लेखकेन प्रदर्शितम् । पितृवाची 'अम्बक'शब्दः स्त्रियामम्बिका भवतीति मतं लेखकेन प्रत्याख्यातम्; नादकारि-
वाचिनः 'अम्बक'शब्दस्य स्त्रीलिङ्गे 'अम्बिका'ति रूपं भवतीति प्रोक्तम् । शरद्-ऋतुः खलु रुद्रस्य स्वसा, याम्बिकेत्युच्यते—इति निबन्धान्ते व्यक्तं प्रतिपादितम् ।]

These two extremely puzzling words are often found used as names or epithets respectively of Rudra (or Rudra-Śiva) and his 'sister' or 'wife', mostly in the post-*Rg Veda* Vedic works as well as in the extant Epics, Purāṇas etc; and, as will be evident from the following pages, there is great difference of opinion among ancient

authorities as regards the formation and meanings of these words, particularly the former one. But, as these derivations and interpretations are not beyond serious objections, we have found it necessary to examine their formations critically and, thus, to see whether we can find out their original and correct meanings.

(a) त्र्यम्बक

This is a hitherto obscure word occurring only once in the Rg. Veda, in the following verse (7.59.12) :

त्र्यम्बकं यजामहे सुगन्धिं पुष्टिवर्धनम् ।
उर्वारुकमिव बन्धनान्मृत्योर्मुक्षीय मामृतात् ॥

which, as its contents, its irrelevant position in the said Rg-Vedic hymn, and the lack of its Pada-pāṭha show, is undoubtedly spurious, but which has been given most relevantly, for citation in the Tryambaka-homa for attainment of Rudra's grace, in all the extant Saṃhitās of the *Yajurveda*, viz. in *Vs* 3.60, *TS* 1.8.6.2, *MS* 1.10.4 (25, p. 84), *KS* 9.7 (32, p. 76), and *KK'S* 8. 10 (p. 87), the last-mentioned two works reading 'रयिपोषणम्' for 'पुष्टिवर्धनम्', in the second pāda. This verse occurs also in *ŚBr* 2.6.2.12 without any variation in reading.

It is hardly necessary to say that 'त्र्यम्बक' is a compound word having 'त्रि' (meaning 'three') as its first member; but insurmountable difficulties arise with regard to its second member, which, from a consideration of the form of the compound, may be taken to be 'अम्बा', 'अम्ब', 'अम्बक' 'अम्बका'. Unfortunately no scholar, early or late, has yet been found to have come forward to tell definitely what this second member actually is and means and why or to suggest its derivation. It is a fact that from the Rg-Vedic times or even earlier the word 'अम्बा' which, as the words 'amme' (meaning 'nurse') in German, 'amma' in old German, and a few similar other show, must have had an Indo-European origin¹, came to be

1. The words 'अम्बा', 'अम्ब', 'अम्बे', 'अम्म', 'अम्मे' etc., used for 'mother' in the South Indian languages of non-Aryan (or Dravidian) origin, need not be taken to be the source of the Vedic word 'अम्बा', which, as well as 'अप्पा' (meaning 'father'), must have had natural origin, being the earliest words which a child can pronounce instinctively, for the first time after birth, to call its nearest relations on earth, viz., its mother and father.

used to mean 'mother', and this use was sanctioned universally by all the Sanskrit lexicographers including Amara-siṃha. But neither the *Rg-Veda* and the other Vedic works nor the early Sanskrit lexicons (such as the *Amara-Kośa*, *Śālvata-Kośa* etc.) know the word 'अम्ब', 'अम्बक', and 'अम्बिका'. Still, evidently in view of the feminine word 'अम्बा'², of the enigmatic compound 'त्र्यम्बक' applied to Rudra in the *Yajur-Veda*, and of the fact that Epic³ and Purāṇic Śiva, who is taken to be identical with Vedic Rudra, is said to have three eyes, some Indian authorities (including a few lexicographers⁴) take 'अम्ब' (the masculine form of 'अम्बा') to mean 'father' and 'अम्बक' to mean 'father' or 'eye'; and, consequently, the word 'त्र्यम्बक' is taken by some to mean 'the father of the three (gods or words)' or 'one having three eyes'. Thus, in his English translation (II, p. 123, No. 403). of Bhaṭṭoji-Dīkṣita's *Siddhānta-Kaumudī* S. C. Vasu renders 'त्र्यम्बक' as 'the father of three worlds'; in commenting on RV 7.59.12 Sāyaṇa takes this word to mean '(Mahādeva) the father of the three (gods) Brahman, Viṣṇu and Rudra,⁵ and in his commentary on TS 1.8.6.2 he explains it as 'one who has three eyes,⁶ in commenting on VS 3.58 and 3.60 Mahīdhara explains this word in a similar way to mean one having three eyes⁷; according to Nīlakaṇṭha this word occurring in *Mbh* 12.284.12 and 89⁸

2. As this word ends in 'अ' and means 'mother', it is taken to be based on a *supposed* masculine word 'अम्ब', which is consequently, taken, without any authority or reason, to mean 'father'.
3. See, for instance, *Mbh.* (Vāṅga. ed) 7.201.11 and 49 (= Poona cr. ed. 7.173. 11 and 38-39), and 13.17.128 ab (Poona cr. ed. 13.17.124 cd. reading वृषभः for 'त्रिलोचनः'); Vāyu-p. (Ānss ed.) 29.124, and 25.2; and so on.
4. Such as Hemacandra, who, in his *Abhidhāna-Cintāmaṇi*, gives. 'नेत्र' as the synonym for 'अम्बक' (neuter).
5. 'त्रयाणां ब्रह्मविष्णुरुद्राणाम् अम्बकं पितरम्—Sāyaṇa.
6. 'त्रोणि अम्बकानि नेत्राणि यस्य असौ त्र्यम्बकस्तम्—Sāyaṇa.
7. See Mahīdhara's Com.—'त्रोणि अम्बकानि नेत्राणि यस्य तादृशम्' and 'नेत्रत्रयोपेतम्'.
8. For these verses see *Mbh* (Poona cr. ed.), Vol. 16—Śānti parvan, Part III, App. I, No. 28, lines 178-9 (at p. 2059) and lines 334-5 (at p. 2069) respectively.

as an epithet of Śiva, respectively means 'one with respect to whom the scriptures, teachers, and (acts of) meditation are the three eyes (i. e. means of knowledge),⁹ and 'one whose three eyes are those bearing the names of the (three) Vedas;¹⁰ and the *Devī-p.* says that goddess Ambikā (i. e., Durgā) is called 'अम्बका', because the Moon, the Sun, and Wind are her three eyes.¹¹ The *Mahābhārata*, on the other hand, says that as Śiva, the lord of the universe, 'betakes himself to (or pervades) the three divine (entities, viz,) Heaven, Waters and Earth', he is called 'अम्बक'.¹² In explaining how Rudra came to be called 'अम्बक', the *Brahmaṇḍa-p.* (Venkaṭ ed.), 1.9.2b-6) says :

ओषधीः प्रतिसंवत्ते रुद्रः क्षीणः पुनः पुनः ॥2b
 प्राप्नोषिफलैर्देवः सम्यगिष्टं फलाधिभिः ।
 त्रिभिरेव कपालैस्तु अम्बकैरोषधीक्षये ॥3
 इज्यते मुनिभिर्यस्मात् तस्मात् अम्बक उच्यते ॥4a
 त्रिसाधनः पुरोडाशस्त्रिकपालस्ततः स्मृतः ।
 अम्बकः स पुरोडाशस्तेनेह अम्बकः स्मृतः ॥6

But very peculiar is the statement made in this matter by the *Śatapatha-Brahmaṇa*¹³, which in its section on Tryambaka-homa, prescribes the offer, to Rudra, of his due share of the oblations

9. 'त्रीणि शास्त्राचार्यध्यानानि अम्बकानि नेत्राणीव गमकानि बोधकानि यस्य स अम्बकः'—*Nilakaṇṭha*.)

(But this interpretation cannot be accepted as plausible, because in this verse of the *Mahābhārata* there is the word 'त्रिनेत्राय' immediately after 'अम्बकाय', thus showing definitely that 'नेत्र' and 'अम्बक' are not synonymous.

10. 'वेदाख्यानि अम्बकानि चक्षूषि यस्य'—*Nilakaṇṭha*.

11. *Devī-P.* (Vaṅga. ed.) 37. 6—

सोमसूर्यानिलास्त्रीणि यस्य नेत्राणि भार्गव ।
 तेन सा अम्बका देवी मुनिभिः परिकीर्तिता ॥

12. *Mbh* 7. 201. 130 (=Poona cr. ed. 7. 173. 89)—

तिस्रो देवीर्यदा चैव भजते भुवनेश्वरः ।

धामपः पृथिवीं चैव अम्बकश्च ततः स्मृतः ॥

(भजते = पालयति—*Nilakaṇṭha*)

13. "एष ते रुद्र भागः सह स्वस्त्राऽम्बिकया तं जुषस्व, स्वाहा (*VS* 3.57)"—*ŚBr* 2.6.2.9.

with the citation of the Mantra "This is thy share, O Rudra; graciously accept it together with thy sister (who is) *ambikā*, Svāhā !" and then says :

"*Ambikā*, indeed, by name is his (Rudra's) sister; (and) this share is his together with her (as a sharer); as this share is his together with a woman (स्त्री, as a sharer), therefore (these oblations) are named अम्बिकाः; (and) thus (he) delivers from Rudra's power those offspring who have been born to him".¹⁴

In this statement we fail to understand why the oblations shared by Rudra originally with his 'sister *Ambikā*' (a woman-स्त्री) are called 'अम्बिकाः' (and not 'अम्बिकाः' or 'अम्बिकाः'), what the *Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa* actually means by the word 'अम्बिक' or 'अम्बिका' (occurring in अम्बिकाः) and how and why the offspring born to the offerer of the said oblations are delivered from Rudra's power. As a matter of fact, this is a highly confused statement based on a complete misunderstanding of the words 'अम्बिका' and 'अम्बिक', so much so that this *Brāhmaṇa* and no other Vedic work, gives out 'अम्बिका', evidently an epithet, as we shall see below, definitely as the 'name' (नामन्) of Rudra's 'sister' (स्वसृ) and makes Keith go so far as to say, without rhyme or reason, that '*Ambikā* as the sister of Rudra' 'seems to derived from the epithet *Tryambaka*'¹⁵ So, there is hardly any doubt that the said statement is the result of a serious confusion with regard to the meaning particularly of the obscure word 'अम्बिक'; and as at least one more palpable instance of a similar confusion has been cited by us elsewhere¹⁶ in connection with the possibility of the Vedic Aryans' contact with the Assyrians or Assyro-Babylonians in a fairly early Vedic period, we cannot overlook it easily.

Following the authorities referred to above and also similar others and in view of the lines. "एष ते वद भागः, सह स्वस्राऽम्बिकया तं जुषस्व,

14. "अम्बिका ह वै नामास्य स्वसा, तयास्यैष सह भागः, तद् यदस्यैष स्त्रिया सह भागस्तस्मात् अम्बिका नाम, तद् या अस्य प्रजा जातास्ता रुद्रियात् प्रमुञ्चति" (ŚBr 2.6.2.9).

15. A. B. Keith, *Religion and Philosophy of the Veda and Upaniṣads*, p. 144.

16. In our article on the source or origin of Rg-Vedic Rudra, which is awaiting publication.

शरद् रद्रस्य स्वसाऽम्बिका [or अम्बिका स्वसा] etc. occurring in the extant *Saṃhitās* and *Brāhmaṇas* of the *Yajur-Veda*¹⁷ (in some of which the word 'अम्बिका' appears to have been taken, as in the *Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa* mentioned above, to be the name of Rudra's sister), modern scholars interpret the compound 'अम्बिक' as one having three mothers, three sisters, three wives, or three eyes. Thus, according to Arbman, Louis Renou and D. R. Bhandarkar this word means Rudra 'who has three mothers';¹⁸ to Macdonell its "meaning appears to be 'one who has three mothers' in allusion to the three-fold division of the universe";¹⁹ Keith takes it to mean one having three wives, sisters or mothers, and says, without explaining its second member, that in it there is possibly 'an allusion to the three divisions of the universe' or 'the epithet refers to the god either as connected with three seasons, or as connected with the three worlds,—heaven, air and earth, as in the case with the Maruts';²⁰ to Griffith it is a name of Rudra as having three wives, sisters or mothers, or three eyes;²¹ and so on. But we are constrained to say that none of these interpretations has the least claim to plausibility. Neither the *Ṛg-Veda* nor any of the other Vedic *Saṃhitās* and *Brāhmaṇas* says anywhere, directly or indirectly, that

17. The line 'एष ते रद्र भगः' etc. occurs in *VS* 3.57, *TS* 1.8.6.1, *KS* 9.7 (29, p. 76) and 36. 14 (25-27, p. 362), *KKS* 8.10 (p. 87), *MS* 1.10.4 (22-27, p. 84) and 1.10.20 (48-50, p. 95), *TBR*. 1.6.10.4, and *ŚBr* 2.6.2.9.

For the line 'शरद् वै रद्रस्य स्वसाऽम्बिका' etc. see *KS* 36.14 (25-27, p. 362), *MS* 1.10.20 (48-50, p. 95), and *TBr* 1.6.10.4 (v.l.—'शरद् वा अस्याम्बिका स्वसा'). About this line as occurring a little differently (i. e. without mention of 'शरद्') in the *Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa* (2.6.2.9) we shall say later.

18. E. Arbman, *Rudra* (Uppsala, 1922) p. 296 ff.; L. Renou, *Vedic India*, p. 63 (§ 125); D. R. Bhandarkar, *Some Aspects of Ancient India Culture*, p. 42.
19. A. A. Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology*, p. 74.
20. A. B. Keith, *Taittirīya Saṃhitā* (English translation), p. 118, note 2; and *Religion and Philosophy of the Veda and Upaniṣads*, pp. 143, 149.
21. R. T. H. Griffith, *The Text of the White Yajur-Veda (Vājasaneyi-Saṃhitā)*, English translation) 3.58 (note at p. 28).

Vedic Rudra ever had *three* mothers²², sisters, wives or eyes,²³ or was the father of any group of three deities, the Maruts, of whom Rudra is repeatedly called the father in the *Ṛg-Veda*, being many more in number than three. As a matter of fact, the Vedic *Saṁhitās* are completely silent about the mention either of even a single mother, sister or wife of Rudra or of her name.²⁴ Of the *Brāhmaṇas* it is only the *Śatapatha* (6.1.3.7ff) which gives a story of the birth, from the Dawn (उषस्) by the year (संवत्सर) and the seasons (ऋतवः), of a boy (कुमार), who cried for names immediately after his birth and was consequently given by Prajāpati as many as eight names including 'Rudra', which was the first.²⁵ But even in this *Brāhmaṇa* there is no mention of Rudra's three mothers.

Stories, similar to that given in the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, are to be found in many of the present *Purāṇas* also, but in these works

-
22. Taking, like Ludwig, Geldner and others, the word 'त्रिमाता' in *RV* 3.56.5 to mean 'he who has three mothers', Macdonell (*Vedic Mythology*, p. 74) feels inclined to find in it the *Ṛg-Vedic* response to Rudra's 'three mothers'. But we must not overlook the facts that 'त्रिमाता' having the accent in the first syllable, is a Tatpuruṣa Compound, and not a Bahuvrīhi, and means, as Venkatamādhava and Sāyaṇācārya say, "the measurer of the three (worlds), and not 'he who has three mothers', and that neither in the said verse nor in any other of the same *Sūkta* there is any mention of Rudra or the slightest reference to this god.
23. It is a fact that in *AV* 11.2.3,7 and *VS* 16.7 Rudra is said to be 'thousand-eyed', but this is evidently due to his past *Ṛg-Vedic* identification with Agni.
24. Although, as we have already said, the *Ṛg-Veda* often calls Rudra the father, and sometimes the progenitor, of the Maruts, and the latter the sons of *Pr̥ṣṇi* (cf. 'पृश्निमातरः'—*RV* 1.23.10, 38.4, 85.2, etc.), *Pr̥ṣṇi* is never said to be Rudra's 'wife.'

Even if *Pr̥ṣṇi* be taken to be the wife of Rudra, the latter is nowhere said to have *three* wives.

25. This story must have been based on the facts that Rudra came to be identified with Agni in the post-*Ṛg-Vedic* days, that Agni has been called 'कुमार' in *RV* 5.2.1, and that every day, throughout the year and in all the seasons, fire was kindled by the Vedic Aryans early in the morning for performance of sacrifices,

there is no mention of the Dawn, the Year and the Seasons; on the other hand, a child, called 'Kumāra Nīla-lohita' or simply 'Nīla-lohita', is said to have appeared all on a sudden in (Rudra—) Mahādeva's lap and to have received from Brahman the name 'Rudra' and seven others.²⁶ Although in the present Epics and Purāṇas, Vedic Rudra, being amalgamated with Śiva (a god of popular origin), has lost much of his Vedic character and gained many additions to his person and activities, these works also are completely silent about his three mothers.

From what has been said above it is evident that the interpretation, hitherto given by scholars, early or late, of the word 'अम्बक' are all completely unauthorised and have consequently no basis to stand upon. Under these circumstances we shall have to try in our own way to determine its meaning, and, for this, we shall have to look to the *Ṛg-Veda* first of all.

We have already said that 'अम्बक' is a compound word presumably having 'अम्बा', 'अम्ब', 'अम्बक' or अम्बका as its second member. Although, in the *Ṛg-Veda*, we do not find 'अम्बक' or 'अम्बका' the word 'अम्ब' (evidently the vocative singular of 'अम्बा') is there. Besides this, the *Ṛg-Veda* has two other words (presumably derived from the same root or base), viz., 'अम्बि' (and its derivatives 'अम्बितमा' and 'अम्बी') and 'अम्बर'. In the Saṃhitās of the *Tajur-Veda* there is a third one, viz., 'अम्बिका'.

Of the words occurring in the *Ṛg-Veda* we find 'अम्बि' used in the form 'अम्बितमे' (feminine vocative-singular of superlative of 'अम्बि' in *RV* 2.41.16 running as follows :

अम्बितमे नदीतमे देवितमे सरस्वति ।
अप्रज्ञस्ता इव स्मसि प्रशस्तिमम्ब नस्कृधि ॥

and it occurs in the form 'अम्बयः' (nominative plural) in *RV* 1.23.19 which runs thus :

26. *Brahmāṇḍa-p.* i. 10.3 ff. and i.5. 72 ff.; *Vāyu-p.* 27. 3ff. and 1.10.73ff.; *Viṣṇu-p.* (Vāṅga. ed.) i.7.8ff. and i.8.1ff.; *Padma-p.* (Ānss ed., *Sṛṣṭi-khaṇḍa*) 3.162-168ab and 188ff.; *Kūrma-p.* (All-India Kashiraj Trust ed.) i.7.24ff and i. 10. 18cd ff.; *Linga-p.* (Calcutta ed.) 1.6.11ff.; and so on.

अम्बयो^१ यन्त्यध्वभिर्जामयो^१ अम्बरीयताम् ।
पुञ्चतीर्मधुना पयः ॥

In explaining the former verse (*RV* 2.41.16) Sāyaṇa takes 'अम्बितमे' to mean 'मातृणां श्रेष्ठे' ('best of mothers') and thus, 'अम्बि' to be synonymous with 'मातृ' ('mother') but in his commentary on the latter verse (*RV* 1.23.16) he explains 'अम्बयः' not simply as 'मातरः' ('mothers'), but as 'मातृस्थानीया आपः' ('waters deserving the place of mothers') and quotes *Kauṣītaki-Brāhmaṇa* 12.2, which says that in the verse 'अम्बयो यन्त्यध्वभिः' (*RV* 1.23.16) it is 'आपः' ('waters') which have been called 'अम्बयः' ('mothers') by way of praise.²⁷ Again, at the very outset of his commentary on this *Rg-Vedic* verse (अम्बयो यन्त्यध्वभिः, etc.) as occurring in *Atharva-Veda* 1.4.1 Sāyaṇa says that, "like the word 'अम्बा', the word 'अम्बि' also is well-known in the Veda as denoting 'mother,'; and then, after referring to *RV* 2.41.16 (अम्बितमे नदीतमे, etc.) and *KBr.* 12.2. (mentioned above) as his authorities, he interprets 'अम्बयः' not simply as 'मातरः' but as 'मातृभूता आपः' (i. e., waters that attained the position of mothers). Thus, following the *Kauṣītaki-Brāhmaṇa* Sāyaṇa takes this word to have been used in the sense of 'mothers' for praise of 'waters' (आपः) which are relevant in the said *Rg-Vedic* verse as well as in a few others of the same Sūkta. We are now to see how far this interpretation can be used relevantly in explaining *RV*. 1.23.16 (अम्बयो यन्त्यध्वभिः, etc.) quoted above.

From Sāyaṇa's commentaries on this verse as occurring in the *Rg-Veda* (1.23.16) and the *Atharva-Veda* (1.4.1) we understand that he construes it as follows :

"अम्बयः अम्बरीयतां जामयः, मधुना पयः पुञ्चतीः, अध्वभिः यन्ति ।"

As we have already seen, Sāyaṇa takes 'अम्बयः' to mean 'मातृस्थानीयाः (or, मातृभूताः) आपः' ('waters which are mother-like') by 'जामयः' he means 'हितकारिण्यो बन्धवः' ('beneficial or serviceable female relations') or 'भगिन्यः' ('sisters') because, as he says, 'in the (sacrificial) act under performance (waters) are helpful like

27. तथा च कौषीतकिब्राह्मणे समाम्नायते—'अम्बयो यन्त्यध्वभिरित्यापो वा अम्बयः' इति ।—Sāyaṇa's com. on *RV* 1.23.16.

sisters',²⁸ and he interprets the expression 'पृञ्चतीर्मधुना पयः', rather queerly, in his com. on RV. 1.23.16 as '.....माधुर्यरसेन युक्तं पयः.... गवादिषु योजयन्त्यः' ('associating in cows etc....milk furnished with the taste of sweetness') and, a bit differently, in his com. on AV.1.4.1 as स्वकीयेन माधुर्यरसेन पयः सोमरसादिकं होमद्रव्यं पयोविकारभूतम् आज्यं वा संयोजयन्त्यः ('furnishing with their own sweet taste the objects of sacrifice such as Soma-juice etc. or ghee which is milk in a changed form'). So, following Sāyaṇa's construction and explanation of the said verse we may translate it thus :

"The mother-like (waters), the sisters (or, beneficial female relations) of the (priests or sacrificers) desiring (performance of their Soma²⁹) sacrifice, go by (their) paths, putting (in cows etc.) milk furnished with sweet taste [or, associating *payas* with (their) taste of sweetness]".

In interpreting the said verse (RV 1.23.16) Mudgala follows Sāyaṇa very faithfully; but Skanda-svāmin's interpretation of it, though being generally the same as that of Sāyaṇa, has the peculiarity in that it takes 'मधु' to be water brought from a stream and kept overnight in a special vessel called एकघन (meant for keeping water for sacrificial and other religious purposes)³⁰ and 'पयः' to be the same as Soma-juice.³¹ According to Venkaṭamādhava the expression 'पृञ्चतीर्मधुना पयः' means 'मधुरेण रसेन प्रत्यक्षमुदकं संपृञ्चत्यः' ('thoroughly associating the visible water with sweet taste').

Following more or less the interpretations of the scholiasts mentioned above Griffith translates this verse, as occurring in the *Rg-Veda*, thus :

"Along their paths the Mothers go, Sisters of priestly ministrants, mingling their sweetness with the milk".

28. जामयो भगिन्यः । क्रियमाणे व्यापारे भगिनीवत् सहायभूता इत्यर्थः ।
Sāyaṇa's com. on AV 1.4.1.

29. That 'अश्वर' is 'सोमभाग' is said by Sāyaṇa in his com. on AV 1.4.1

30-31 पृञ्चतीः संपर्चयन्त्यः स्वावयवभूतेन मधुना ।

इत्युदकनाम 'मधु' (*Nighanṭu* 1.12) । वसतीवर्येकघनाख्येन पयः सोमलक्षणमुदकम् ।

—Skanda—Svāmin's Com.

It has already been said that this verse also occurs in 1.4.1, and Whitney and Griffith translate it as follows :

“The mothers go on their ways, sisters of them that make sacrifice, mixing milk with honey” (Whitney).

“Along their paths the Mothers go, Sisters of priestly ministrants, *blending their water with the mead.*” (Griffith).

As Ludwig, Grassmann, Geldner and others' renderings of this verse are not very materially different from those of Whitney and Griffith, we need not mention them here.

But it is hardly necessary to say that these interpretations and translations are not at all satisfactory or convincing. If 'अम्बि' mean simply 'mother', as these scholars say, then the 'waters' being called 'अम्बयः' and thus being conceived as 'the mothers' of the priests or sacrificers desiring performance of their (Soma) sacrifice, are again called their 'जामयः' (sisters or other female relations). This conception of double relation of the same object (viz. waters) with the same persons (viz., the priests or sacrificers) for the same functions of the former (i. e., waters) is extremely awkward and also absolutely unnecessary, because the mothers generally and naturally render much greater service to their sons than the sisters to their brothers, thus leaving no scope for the latter. According to Sāyaṇa, 'waters', like sisters, are helpful in a (sacrificial) act under performance; but can the sisters 'put in cows etc. milk furnished with sweet taste' (as Sāyaṇa and Mudgala say), or have they got (or do they carry) any sweet taste of their own (cf. 'स्वकीयेन माघुर्यसेन'), with which they can sweeten the objects of sacrifices such as Soma-juice or ghee (as Sāyaṇa says) or does the special kind of water with which they mix the Soma-juice, form a part of their own self (स्वावयवभूत, as Skanda-svāmin says), or can they add sweet taste to water (as Veṅkaṭamādhava says), and, if so, how? As the said interpretations of RV 1.23.16 raise these abnormal questions but fail to enable us to give suitable replies, there is hardly any doubt that all these difficulties arise from the wrong interpretation of this verse, particularly of the word 'अम्बयः' used in it. If we set aside the other objections, the very presence of the word 'जामयः' in the said verse shows that 'अम्बयः' cannot mean 'mothers'. So, for gett-

ing to the other possible meanings of this word ('अम्ब') we should derive it, as Sāyaṇa has done, from the Ātmanepadī root 'अबि' (i. e. 'अम्ब' meaning 'to roar', 'to sound,—अबि शब्दे) with the Unādi suffix इ (meant for denoting the subject) in accordance with the Unādi-sūtra 'अच इः' (4.138), but we must take it primarily to be an *epithet* meaning (that) which roars or makes sound and secondarily to mean, by convention in rare but relevant cases, those which have this epithet, viz., water and mother. Thus, like 'अम्भस्' (derived from √अम्भ्—to sound, and meaning 'water'), 'नद' (derived from √नद्—to roar, and meaning 'river') and many other similar words, 'अम्बि' is derived from its basic root 'अबि' (i. e. 'अम्ब'—to roar, to sound) and conventionally taken, like 'अम्बि', to mean 'water', perhaps because water is found to create sound in various ways—by falling on earth as rain and hail, by flowing in strong currents in rivers and fountains, by creating water-falls, by giving rise to lightning and thunder and so on. Convention also requires 'अम्बि' to mean 'mother', as scholiasts rightly say, evidently because a naturally affectionate mother (even among the lower animals) has to make particular sounds to warn her little children against dangers or to call them to her side for their safety. But in the matter there is a remarkable difference between the meanings of the words 'अम्भस्', 'नद', 'अम्बु' etc., on the one hand, and those of 'अम्बि', on the other. Whereas in case of the former words their conventional meanings come to the forefront, thus pointing very prominently to the material objects taken by convention to be denoted by them and throwing their literal meanings into the background, in the case of the latter (i. e., the word 'अम्बि') its literal meanings are more prominent and inseparable even though it is used in the conventional sense. As to the word 'अम्बा' (meaning 'mother') it may be said that, being uttered instinctively for the first time by a little child incapable of speaking, this word had a natural origin and did not stand in need of being derived from a root. So, its meaning 'mother', unlike those of 'अम्बि' a word derived from the root 'अबि' i. e. 'अम्ब', is direct and natural and has got no idea of any root at its base. As human civilization made its progress, there was an ever-increasing attempt to express ideas not only by finding new words for them but also by forming kindred words on the roots or bases of those already in use in society; and

it is hardly necessary to say that these derived words, even though used to mean some particular things by convention, could not, in many cases, get over the meaning of their roots or bases.

That the conventional meaning 'mother' given to 'अम्बि' has, at its basis, its etymological meaning of roaring or sounding is quite evident from RV 8. 72. 5, which gives a very nice poetic description of a bright lightning-flash from a cloud in the sky and the closely following thunder, through the imagery of a brightly white newborn calf running unobstructed after its birth and its mother lowing as if in appreciation of the extraordinary exploit of her child. This verse says :

चरन् वृत्सो रश्निह निदातारं न विन्दते । वेत्ति स्तोत्रं अम्ब्यम् ।

["The running calf, shining bright here (in the sky), finds none to check (it, and) wants (its) roaring (mother) to praise it"].

The word 'अम्ब्यम्' in this verse is the Accusative singular of 'अम्बी', the alternative feminine form of 'अम्बि' derived with the addition of डोष् (> ई) in accordance with the Vārttika "कुटिकारादक्तिनः" under Pāṇini's rule "बहुविभक्त्यश्च" (4.1.45). As the lightning-flash is closely followed by the thunder, and as the calf (in the form of the lightning-flash) does not want its mother (in the form of the cloud) to look silently at it like a dumb spectator but expects her to be vociferous in full appreciation of its highly creditable work, the word 'अम्बी' has the underlying meaning of 'roaring', which, here, is of the first importance.

Although we know of the literary use of the root 'अम्बि' (i. e., अम्ब) meaning 'to roar', 'to sound' in the Vedic or non-Vedic literature, the Rg-Vedic verse quoted above bears sufficient evidence to the great antiquity of the said in-lying meaning of the root 'अम्बि' (i. e., 'अम्ब').

From what has been said above it is evident that we should take the word 'अम्बयः', in RV 1.23.16 to mean 'the roaring (waters)', and with this meaning of this word we should translate the said verse thus :

"The roaring (waters), the (singing) sisters (or, female relations) of the (priests or sacrificers) desiring (performance of

their Soma-) sacrifice, go by (their) paths, mixing milk with Soma-juice".

As a matter of fact, a careful study of the *Rg-Veda* shows that in the early *Rg-Vedic* period, when the females in the Vedic society enjoyed much greater freedom, the Vedic Aryans took, at least in the family rites, the active assistance of their sisters and other near female relations, who helped the male members by extracting juice from Soma plants founded particularly in mortars,³² by bringing water in jars from rivers etc.,³³ by mixing milk with Soma-juice kept in jars (कलश) or vats (क्षौण), by diluting the mixture properly with water if necessary, and by doing similar other works possible for them. From the *Rg-Veda* we learn that, while thus working, the Vedic females used to sing songs.³⁴ But with the progress of time the Aryan females came gradually to be deprived of this right of active co-operation in religious matters and were pushed into the background. From the said *Rg-Vedic* verse it appears that at the time of its composition the females of the Vedic society were no longer allowed to take active part, like males, in the performance of Vedic, particularly Soma, sacrifices. So the roaring waters, moving along their particular paths leading to the jars or vats containing Soma-juice, are said to be doing, like the singing sisters or female relations (of older days), the work of mixing milk proportionately with Soma-juice (which is often called मधु in the *Rg-Veda*).³⁵ It is hardly necessary to say that abnormal consumption of Soma-juice in the different spheres of individual, social, religious and political life of the Vedic Aryans made Soma practically a rare thing even in the late *Rg-Vedic* period. and the result was that, with the progress of time, people felt more and more the necessity of diluting Soma-juice with water to meet the demand. This is evidently why in the said *Rg-Vedic* verse 'the roaring waters' (and not the singing sisters or female relations of the priests or sacrificers) have been said to mix milk with Soma-juice.

We have already seen that 'अम्बि', formed by adding the Unādi suffix इ to अम्बि (i. e. अम्ब), primarily means '(that) which roars or

32. See *RV* 1.28.3-4; 1.89.3.

33. Cf., for instance, *RV* 1.191.14.

34. Cf., for instance, *RV* 1.92.3.

35. See, for instance, *RV* 4.26.5, 4.27.5, 6.20.3, 8.69.6, and so on.

makes sound'. Consequently, 'अम्बितमे', which in RV 2.41.16, is one of the epithets of the river Sarasvatī, must be taken to mean 'the best roarer' or 'the best of those having roaring (waters)'³⁶, and this meaning finds strong support in the fact that in the said verse (i. e. RV 2.41.16 which contains the epithet 'अम्बितमे') Sarasvatī has been addressed as 'अम्ब' ('O mother') and that in a good number of Rg-Vedic verses this river has been extolled for her mighty flood, high speed, surging waves, and loud roaring.³⁷

Our statements made above make it clear that the Ātmanepadī root 'अबि' (i. e. 'अम्ब'), may safely be taken to mean 'to roar', 'to sound'. So, the words 'अम्ब', 'अम्बा', 'अम्बक' and 'अम्बिका' may be derived of follows :

'अम्ब', (literally meaning 'roarer' 'maker of sound').—अम्बते शब्दायते इति अम्बः । √अबि (i. e. √अम्ब) + (कर्तरि) अच् (>अ), by Pāṇini's rule 3.1.134 -नन्दिग्रहिपचादिभ्यो ल्युणिन्यचः ।

'अम्ब' (literally meaning 'roar', 'sound').—अम्ब्यते शब्दयते इति अम्बः । √अबि + (भावे) अप् (बाहुलकात्) ।

['अम्ब' may, by convention, mean "father", because, like a mother, a father also not rarely makes sound to control his children.

'अम्बा' (meaning, by convention, 'mother').—'अम्ब' (masculine, meaning 'father' by convention) with the feminine suffix आप् (>आ).]

36. This second meaning we may have if we take 'अम्बितमे' to be equivalent to 'अम्बिमत्तमे' just like 'अपस्तमा' which, an epithet of a river in RV 10.75.7, is equivalent to 'अपस्वत्तमा' (according to Sāyaṇa) or 'अपस्वितमा' (according to Udgītha).

37. See, for instance, RV 1.3.12 (Sarasvatī, a huge mass of water महो अर्णः), 6.52.6 (swelling with rivers) 7.36.6 (mother of floods, swelling with water the roaring streams), 7.95.1 (moving swiftly and surpassing all other streams in her greatness), 7.96.1 (the mightiest of rivers), 7.96.5 (high waves) and so on.

‘अम्बर’ (meaning ‘sky’).— अम्बं शब्दं राति घत्ते इति अम्बरम् । अम्ब + √रा + क (> अ) । (It is well known that आकाश is शब्दगुण, i. e. has ‘sound’ as its attribute).

‘अम्बक’ (meaning ‘one who habitually roars or makes sound’).— अम्बितुं शब्दितुं शीलम् अस्य इति अम्बकः । √अम्बि + (कर्तरि) वुञ् (> अक) । Cf. Pāṇini’s rule 3.2.146 (बाहुलकात्).

‘अम्बक’ [meaning ‘one who causes (something) to roar or sound’]—अम्बयति शब्दं कारयति इति अम्बकः । √अम्बि + णिच् + (कर्तरि) ण्वुल् (> अक) ।

As ‘अम्बक’ may be derived in the said two ways, ‘अम्बक’ may be analysed thus :

- (i) त्रिषु पृथिव्यन्तरिक्षद्युषु अम्बकः (शब्दकारकः)—one who roars (or makes sound) in the three (regions, viz., earth, air and heaven).
- (ii) त्रयाणां (पृथिव्यन्तरिक्षद्युषूनाम्) अम्बकः (शब्दकारकः)—one who makes the three (regions, viz., earth, air and heaven) roar or sound (with his roaring).

That Rudra controls the three regions, viz., the earth, air and heaven, and fills these with his roar, is known from a number of R̥g-Vedic verses, such as RV 1.114.5, 1.122.1, 2.1.6, 5.41.3 and 8.20.17 (in which Rudra has been called the extremely powerful god of heaven), 7.46.2 (which says that Rudra thinks of the earthly beings through his lordship and of the heavenly ones through his imperial sway), 7.46.3 (in which it is stated that Rudra’s blazing dart, i. e. the lightning-flash, passes by the earth after being hurled down from heavens), 10.92.5 (which says that as Rudra proceeds, attaining high speed and roaring frequently and violently in the intermediate region, viz., the sky, floods rush forward and cover up the extensive earth), and so on.

It should be mentioned here that although in RV 6.49.10 Rudra has been called ‘the father of the universe (सुवनस्य पितरं.... रुद्रम्), the word ‘अम्बक’ must not be taken to mean ‘the father of the three (regions or worlds)’, because in that case we have to take ‘अम्बिका’ to be the feminine form of ‘अम्बक’ (meaning ‘father’) but this is impossible as will be evident from our interpretation of ‘अम्बिका’ (which is given below).

(b) अम्बिका

This word is the feminine form of 'अम्बक' meaning '(habitual) roarer or maker of sound', and for its derivation we are to look to Pāṇini's rule 7.3.44—प्रत्ययस्थात् कात् पूर्वस्यात् इदाप्यसुपः. So, in its origin, it is an epithet meaning 'one (a female) who roars or makes sound (habitually)'.

The earliest use of this word is found in connection with Tryambaka-homa (in Sākamedha in Rājasūya) in the extant Saṁhitās and Brāhmaṇas of only the *Yajur-Veda*. As we have said above, the *Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa* gives it out to be the 'name' (नाम) of Rudra's sister.³⁸ But, strangely enough, this statement of this Brāhmaṇa has express support neither of any of the Saṁhitās of the *Yajur-Veda* nor of the *Taittirīya-Brāhmaṇa*, although these works, as their wordings show³⁹, appear to have, as regards 'अम्बिका', the same view as that of the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*. So, the idea that 'अम्बिका' is the name of Rudra's sister, must have had a much earlier beginning. But who was this 'अम्बिका' and whence did she come?

As we have already seen, the *Ṛg-Veda* does not say anywhere that Rudra ever had a father, mother, sister or wife. As a matter of fact, this Veda and also the *Sāma-Veda* and the *Atharva-Veda* are completely silent about anyone, divine or non-divine, called 'अम्बिका' nor do they use the word 'अम्बिका' at all. Even in the Saṁhitās and Brāhmaṇas of the *Yajur-Veda* there is no mention of 'अम्बिका' anywhere beyond the particular passages on Tryambaka homa. So, great doubt arises as to the authenticity of the statement of the *Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa* as regards 'अम्बिका'. As, thus, 'अम्बिका' as a personal being, divine or otherwise, was non-existent or untraceable in the pre—*Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa* period, it appears that

38. See *ŚBr.* 2.6.2.9—स जुहोति 'एष ते रुद्र भागः, सह स्वस्त्राऽम्बिकया तं जुषस्व, स्वाहा' इति । अम्बिका ह वै नामास्य स्वसा....; and 2.6.2.13या ह वै सा रुद्रस्य स्वसाऽम्बिका नाम सा ह वै भागस्येष्टे.... ।

39. Cf. "एष ते रुद्र भागः, सह स्वस्त्राऽम्बिकया तं जुषस्व"—*VS* 3.57, *TS* 1.8.6.1, *MS* 1.10.4 (22, p. 84—v. 1. 'तं जुषस्व सह स्वस्त्राऽम्बिकया') and 1.10.20 (48—50, p. 94—v. 1. as in 1.10.4), *KS* 9.7 (29, p. 96—v. 1.—omits. 'तम्') and 36.14 (25-27, p. 362). *KKs* 8.10 (p. 87), *TBr* 1.6.10.4.

the obscure word “अम्बिका” (containing the part ‘अम्बिक’ of unknown meaning) made ‘अम्बिका’ equally obscure and also problematic, and confusion arose about it long before the period of the *Śatapatha-Brahmaṇa*. It is a fact that the *Kāṭhaka-Saṃhitā* (in a different passage), and also the *Taittirīya-Brahmaṇa*, say definitely that शरद् (the Autumn Season) is Rudra’s ‘sister’⁴⁰ but the confusion as regards ‘अम्बिका’ being long-continued and deep-rooted, persisted and could not be got rid of very easily, and this is evident from a unique and undoubtedly wrong passage of the *Maitrāyaṇī-Saṃhitā*, which, unlike those of the *Kāṭhaka-Saṃhitā* and the *Taittirīya-Brahmaṇa* referred to above, gives out शरद् (Autumn Season) to be the source of Rudra’s origin (योनि) and his ‘sister’ (स्वसा) to be ‘अम्बिका’.⁴¹ This wrong statement of the *Maitrāyaṇī-Saṃhitā* shows

40. See *KS* 36.14 (25-27, p. 362)—शरद् वै रुद्रस्य स्वसाऽम्बिका, ताम् एषोऽन्ववचरति, तस्मादेव शरदि भूयिष्ठं हन्ति; *TBr* 1.6.10.4—शरद् वा अस्याम्बिका स्वसा, तथा वा एष हिनस्ति ।

41. See *MS* 1.10.20 (48-50, p. 94)—शरद् वै रुद्रस्य योनिः, स्वसाऽम्बिका, एतां वा एषोऽन्ववचरति, तस्माच् शरदि भूयिष्ठं हन्ति ।
For the corresponding passages of the *Kāṭhaka-Saṃhitā* (36.14) and the *Taittirīya-Brahmaṇa* (1.6.10.4) see the immediately preceding foot-note.

It is to be noted that, by giving out ‘शरद्’ (the Autumn Season) to be ‘the source of Rudra’s origin’ (रुद्रस्य योनिः) and his ‘sister’ (स्वसा) to be ‘अम्बिका’, the said passage (1.10.20) of the *Maitrāyaṇī-Saṃhitā* unlike those of the *Kāṭhaka-Saṃhitā* and the *Taittirīya-Brahmaṇa* (referred to above) clearly differentiates ‘शरद्’ from Rudra’s ‘sister’ (स्वसा). As ‘शरद्’ is thus distinguished from Rudra’s ‘स्वसा अम्बिका’, and as Rudra is said to follow the latter (cf. the pronoun ‘एताम्’) in her train, Rudra cannot be said reasonably to ‘kill most in शरद्’. So, the word ‘योनिः’ in the said passage of the *Maitrāyaṇī-Saṃhitā*, which is wanting in the other two passages quoted above (in fn. 40), must have been added wrongly and has, consequently, to be omitted for giving it a better sense. Here we cannot overlook the fact that a little after the said passage of the *Maitrāyaṇī-Saṃhitā* says: रुद्र, एष ते भागः, तेनावसेन परो मूजवतोऽस्तीहि पिनाकहस्तः कृत्तिवासा अबततधन्वा इति, गिरिवं रुद्रस्य योनिः,

that the obscure and problematic word 'अम्बिका' made it extremely difficult even for ancient authorities to determine correctly the mutual relation between शरद्, रुद्र and अम्बिका and the result was that शरद् (the Autumn Season) was taken by some to be Rudra's sister and by others to be the source of his origin (i. e., his mother), while all of these ancient authorities appear to agree in taking अम्बिका to be the name of Rudra's sister, totally overlooking the fact that there is no trace of any personal being, divine or otherwise, called अम्बिका in any of the Vedic works earlier than the extant Saṃhitās and Brāhmaṇas of the *Yajur-Veda*, in which, as we have already said, the word 'अम्बिका' occurs for the first time in connection with Tryambaka-homa. Under these circumstances we feel it necessary to try to explain, in a relevant and reasonable way, the said passages of the extant Saṃhitās and Brāhmaṇas of the *Yajur-Veda* in which there is mention of the word 'अम्बिका'.

We have shown elsewhere that Vedic Rudra was a highly mischievous and destructive god, and that his widely popular name 'Rudra' (meaning 'Howler', 'Roarer') was originally not a name but a most prominent epithet of his. Similarly, the word 'शरद्' derived from √शृ (meaning 'to kill', 'to destroy', 'to tear asunder', 'to injure') with the Uṇādi suffix 'अदि' (>'अद्') is an epithet (in the feminine gender) meaning 'that which kills, destroys or injures', but it is used as the name of the Autumn Season, because, coming immediately after the rains, this Season causes various kinds of diseases such as cough, fever etc. and is thus between creative of sufferings of human beings and destructive of human life.⁴² Like Rudra, शरद् (the Autumn Season) also is a roarer, because, during this season, clouds roar and pour out their last vestige of water, and the ambitious conquerors' hosts attack enemy-States by raising

अतो वा एषोऽन्वम्यवचारं प्रजाः शमायते, etc." in which, as well as in the corresponding passage of *KS* 36.14 (25-27, p.362), a mountain (गिरि) has been said to be the source or origin (योनिः) of Rudra.

42. Cf. Sāyaṇa's com. on *TS* (1.8.6.1-2)—'शरत्कालो हि पीनस-ज्वराद्युत्पादनेन हिंसकः, तद्वदियमम्बिका हिंसिका, ततः शरद् इत्युच्यते ।

war-cries and making people wail for their life and property.⁴³ It is, therefore, quite in the fitness of things that the Autumn Season has been named 'शरद्' and called Rudra's sister (स्वसा) described as अम्बिका (meaning 'roaring'). As it was a popular belief that, being the creator of all kinds of human sufferings consequent upon destruction of property and diseases and death, Rudra caused also these in Autumn most extensively in company with his roaring sister Śarad, some of the Saṁhitās of the *Yajur-Veda*, as well as the *Taittirīya-Brahmaṇa*, have the following lines :

“एष ते रुद्र भागः, सह स्वसाऽम्बिकया तं जुषस्व”⁴⁴

[“This, O Rudra, is thy share; with (thy) *roaring* sister enjoy it”]

शरद्वै रुद्रस्य स्वसाऽम्बिका, तामेषोज्ज्वलचरति, तस्मादेष शरदि भूयिष्ठं हन्ति”⁴⁵

[“Verily Autumn is Rudra's *roaring* sister; following her this (god) moves about; consequently, this (god) kills most in Autumn”], and

“शरदा अस्याम्बिका स्वसा, तया वा एष हिनस्ति”⁴⁶

[“Autumn, indeed, is the *roaring* sister of this (god Rudra); (together) with her this (god) kills”].

From what has been said about it is evident that the word 'अम्बिका' occurring in the said passages of the *Yajur-Veda Saṁhitās* and the *Taittirīya-Brahmaṇa* is an epithet (and not the name) of Rudra's sister and means a '(female) that roars'.

In his commentary on TS 1.8.6.1 Sāyaṇa interprets 'अम्बिका' as 'हिसिका', (injurious, maleficent)⁴⁷ but, as this interpretation has got no authority in its support, it cannot be accepted as plausible.

43. More information on this point will be given on another occasion.

44. For mention of the texts containing this line see fns. 39 and 38 above.

45. KS 36.14 (25-27, p. 362).

46. TBr. 1.6.10.4

47. For the text of Sāyaṇa's com. see fn. 42 above.

As we have seen above, it is only the *Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa* (2.6.2.9, 13) which gives out 'अश्विन्विका' to be the name of Rudra's sister, keeping completely silent about 'शरद्'. This statement of this *Brāhmaṇa* with complete silence about 'शरद्' must be due, firstly, to the extreme obscurity of the meaning of this word as well as of that of 'अश्विन्वक'⁴⁸ and, secondly, to the wrong text of the *Maitrāyaṇī-Saṃhitā* (1.10.20) in which the Autumn season (शरद्) has been said to be the source of origin (योनि) of Rudra. Besides these there seems to be another no-less-serious reason, but this we intend to state with full details on another occasion.

Although the said statement of *Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa* as regards 'अश्विन्विका' must be taken as wrong, the posterity blindly followed it, with the result that a mother-goddess named Ambikā came into being and became the object of wide popular worship.

Abbreviation

ĀnSS.	=	Ānandāśrama Sanskrit series (Poona)
AV	=	<i>Atharva-Veda</i> (Śaunaka Saṃhitā)
Com.	=	Commentary.
Ed.	=	Edition, or edited by.
KBr	=	Kauṣītaki-Brāhmaṇa.
KKS	=	<i>Kaṣiṣṭhala-Kaṭha-Saṃhitā</i> (of the <i>Tajur-Veda</i>) ed. Raghu Vīra, 1932.
KS	=	<i>Kāṭhaka-Saṃhitā</i> (ed. Svādhyāya-Maṇḍala 1943.

-
48. That the meaning of 'अश्विन्वक' was an insoluble problem to the ancient authorities, is evident from the extremely hazy and enigmatic statements made by them in connection with it in ŚBr 2.6.2.9 (quoted above in fn. 14) and in KS. 36.14 (25-27, p. 362) and MS 1.10.20 (48-50, p. 95), which say respectively :

‘अश्विन्वै स्त्री भगनाम्नी, तस्मात् अश्विन्विका, अप्रतिष्ठितो वा एष यस्याप्रतिष्ठितं हविरप्रतिष्ठिताश्च अश्विन्विकाः.....(KS), and

‘अश्विन्वै स्त्री भगनाम्नी, तस्मात् अश्विन्विका, यस्य वै हविरप्रतिष्ठितम् अप्रतिष्ठितः सः, अप्रतिष्ठिता अस्य अश्विन्विकाः.....(MS).

- Mbh* = *Mahābhārata* (Vaṅga. ed. unless otherwise indicated).
- MS* = *Maitrāyaṇi-Samhitā* (of the *Yajur-Veda*) ed. Svādhyāya-Maṇḍala 1942.
- p. = (as in '*Brahma-p*' = *Purāṇa*
- Poona cr. ed. = Poona critical edition (published by the ABORI, Poona).
- RI* = *R̥g-Veda*.
- ŚBr* = *Śatapatha-Brahmaṇa* (ed. Acyuta-Granthamālā, Vārāṇasi).
- TS* = *Taittirīya-Samhitā* (of the *Yajur-Veda*), Svādhyāya-Maṇḍala, 2nd ed.
- Vaṅga = Vaṅgavāsī Press, Calcutta.
- Veṅkaṭ. = Veṅkateśvara Press, Bombay.
- VS* = *Vājasaneyi-Samhitā* (of the *White-Yajur-Veda*) ed. Nirṇaya Sāgara Press, Bombay, 1922.

VIṢṆUDHARMOTTARA PURĀṆA ON ARIṢṬAS

By

LALLANJI GOPAL

[अरिष्टानां (= मृत्युसूचकचिह्नानां) विवरणं यथा विष्णुधर्मोत्तरपुराणे (३/२३८ अ०) दृश्यते, तथा योगशास्त्रे, देवलधर्मसूत्रे, महाभारते, लिङ्ग-पुराणे, मार्कण्डेयपुराणे, वायुपुराणे, चरकसंहितायां, भेलसंहितायां चोपलभ्यते । विष्णुधर्मोत्तरीयारिष्टविवरणेन सह एतद्ग्रन्थगतानां विवरणानां तुलना कृता लेखकेन । सिद्धान्तितं च लेखकेन यद् विष्णुधर्मोत्तरगतं विवरणं न कश्चिद् एकमेव ग्रन्थम् (उपरिनिर्दिष्टम्) आश्रित्य लिखितम् । अरिष्टानि प्रथमतः आयुर्वेदशास्त्रकारैर्विवृतानि, ततश्च योगशास्त्रकारैः । पुराणेषु योगविद्या-विवरणप्रसङ्गे अरिष्टानां विवरणं प्रदत्तम् ।

महाभारतीयारिष्टविवरण - विष्णुधर्मोत्तरगत्तारिष्टविवरणयोर्नात्यन्तं सादृश्यमवलोक्यते । वाग्वादिपुराणगत-विवरणेन सह विष्णुधर्मोत्तरगत-विवरणस्य सादृश्यं स्फुटमेव दृश्यते । देवलधर्मसूत्रीयारिष्टविवरणस्य भूयः सादृश्यं विष्णुधर्मोत्तरगतविवरणेन सहास्ति । चिकित्साशास्त्रगतारिष्टविवरणस्य भूयानंशो विष्णुधर्मोत्तरगत्तारिष्टविवरणे उपलभ्यते ।

अरिष्टविवरण-परीक्षणेन विष्णुधर्मोत्तरपुराणरचनायाः कालोऽपि अनुमातुं शक्यते । अस्य रचनाकालः ६२८-१००० ख्रीष्टीयवर्षमध्ये, ६००-१००० वर्षमध्ये वा निर्णीतः । ५०० ख्रीष्टीयवर्षात् प्रागिदं रचितमिति केचित् । ५००-७०० ख्रीष्टीयाब्दो रचनाकालोऽस्येत्यन्ये; ४००-५०० ख्रीष्टीयाब्द इत्यपरे ।

विष्णुधर्मोत्तरगत्तारिष्टविषयकाध्यायस्य रचना ४००-५०० ख्रीष्टीयाब्दयोर्मध्ये जातेति लेखकेन निरूपितम् ।

In a recent study¹ Dr. Ramesh Chandra Srivastava has analysed those portions of the *Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa* which contain material on medicinal science. He has concluded that these chapters dealing with Āyurvedic material are based on the *Aṣṭāṅgasaṁ*

1. *Viṣṇu Dharmottara Purāṇa Kā Cikitsā Vaijñānika Adhyāyana*. Unpublished thesis approved for the Ph. D. degree of Banaras Hindu University, 1981.

graha of Vāgbhata.² He has indicated the parallels particularly when he analyses passages on basic principles.³ Dr. Srivastava has listed verses which the *Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa* has common with the *Agnipurāṇa*,⁴ but he has not prepared any such list of verses common to the *Viṣṇudharmottara* and the *Aṣṭāṅgasāṅgraha*. In the section on *ariṣṭas* Dr. Srivastava merely explains the nature of the various indications. He has not pointed out parallels from the *Aṣṭāṅgasāṅgraha* or any other medicinal text. It seems that he is conscious that there is no close parallel between the *Viṣṇudharmottara* and the medicinal texts so far as the *ariṣṭas* are concerned.

The account of the *ariṣṭas* in the *Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa*, khaṇḍa III, Chapter 238 has its own unique nature. It has certain features which bring it closer to the passages on *ariṣṭas* described in the context of Yoga in the *Devaladharmasūtra*⁵, *Mahābhārata*⁶ and *Vāyu*⁷, *Mārkaṇḍeya*⁸ and *Līṅga*⁹ *Purāṇas*. On the same hand, the close connection of the chapter in the *Viṣṇudharmottara* with the system of Āyurveda is also evident.

We can, for the sake of convenience, divide the chapter into two sections. The first runs upto verse 23; the second includes verses 24 to 33. The first records the premonitory signs for death after a specified period. Though most of the indications on *ariṣṭas*, generally speaking, can ultimately be traced to the ancient texts on Āyurveda, which have a very detailed account, the manner in which they occur in the *Viṣṇudharmottara* has a distinctive character. The medicinal texts also in some cases indicate death after a specified period. But a connected and consolidated account, in which the period decreases gradually from one year to one month and then to one day and finally to immediate death, is not to be found in

2. *Ibid*, pp. 17, 349.

3. *Ibid*, Chapter II.

4. *Ibid*, pp. 379-92.

5. It is quoted in Lakṣmīdhara's *Kṛtyakalpataru*, *Mokṣakāṇḍa*, pp. 248-50. Our own reconstruction of the *Devaladharmasūtra* will be published shortly.

6. (Critical edition) Śāntiparva, 305.

7. Chapter XIX.

8. Chapter 43.

9. I. 91.

the Ayurvedic texts. The *Viṣṇudharmottara* shares this feature with the *Devaladharmasūtra*, *Mahābhārata* and the *Purāṇas*. If we compare the relevant verses in the *Viṣṇudharmottara* with the passages in these texts, we find that no single verse in the *Viṣṇudharmottara* was borrowed in full from any of these texts. Most of the indications, sometimes in identical or similar words, occur in one or the other text. But the author of the *Viṣṇudharmottara* seems to have introduced definite changes. At places he adds new signs, while at others he drops some of the signs. There is some difference in as much as he mentions the same indication to refer to death after a different period of time.

Now we may analyse the indications for different periods in the *Viṣṇudharmottara* noting their parallels in other texts. As the *Līṅgapurāṇa* is known to have borrowed its account of the *ariṣṭas* from that in the *Vāyupurāṇa*¹⁰, we have not noted the parallels with the *Līṅgapurāṇa*. Likewise, the account in the *Mahābhārata* is very summarised and brief and has very limited cases of parallels. Hence, we have not indicated the similarities with the verses in the *Mahābhārata*.

(1) Verse 4—It refers to the death of a person after a year, if he sees the light of the moon in the day time, or the shadow of the moon and the sun (respectively in daytime and night) and their setting.¹¹ There is nothing to match it in the *Devaladharmasūtra*, *Mahābhārata*, *Vāyupurāṇa* *Mārkaṇḍeyapurāṇa*¹² or any of the texts on medicine.

(2) Verse 5—It refers to the death of a person after a year if he sees the light of fire in the sky, or the *dhrupa* (star) or the *arundhatī* star which is not visible to others.¹³ It is similar to MP 2, VP 2 and Devala 2. These texts have the additional expression

10. R. C. Hazra, *Studies in the Purāṇic Records on Hindu Rites and Customs*, p. 96.

11. न तु कर्माणि यो स्वप्ने प्रभाकर्म निशाभूतः ।
छायी चन्द्राकंयोर्वापि तयोश्च नमनं तथा ॥

12. Hereinafter *Devaladharmasūtra*, *Vāyupurāṇa* and *Mārkaṇḍeyapurāṇa* have been abbreviated as Devala, VP and MP.

13. देवमार्गे प्रभा वह्नेर् ध्रुवं तारामरुन्धतीम् ।
पश्यत्यदृष्टामन्यैर्वा मृत्युः स्यात्तस्य वत्सरात् ॥

somacchāyam which seems to have inspired verse 4 of the *Viṣṇu-dharmottara*.

(3) Verse 6—‘He, who does not see the light of other luminous objects, is said to die in the eleventh month’.¹⁴ The indication for the eleventh month in the other texts also concerns luminous objects, but differs considerably in the wording.

(4) Verse 7—‘He, who in the night in the dream emits urine or stool (of the colour of) gold or silver, goes to the residence of Yama in the tenth month’.¹⁵ Its parallel is Devala 5, VP 4, and MP 4, with the difference that these texts place *mūtram purīṣam* first and *suvarṇam rajataṁ* later and have *pratyakṣam* for *niśi*. It is, however, nearer to VP and MP than to Devala, which adds *prabham* to *suvarṇarajata* and mentions it as a premonitory sign for death in the ninth month.

(5) Verse 8—‘By seeing demons, ghosts, goblins or *Yakṣas* or other supra-sensory beings the death is certain in the ninth month’.¹⁶ The VP does not have any indication for the ninth month, nor does it have anything of this type listed elsewhere. The first line of MP 5 and the second line of Devala 4 resemble this verse. It is to be noted that the line in the MP contains a reference to the cities of the *gandharvas*, but Devala mentions it in the other line.

(6) Verse 9—‘He, who becomes weak (even when) taking large quantity of rich food or becomes bulky even though not eating, attains death in the eighth month’.¹⁷ In this case also we do not find in other texts any parallel mentioning this indication or referring to the premonitory sign for death in the eighth month. Devala 6 and MP 6 are similar to it in mentioning death after the eighth month on the basis of sudden bulkiness or thinness. But there is

14. सप्रभानामथान्येषां प्रभां यस्तु न पश्यति ।

तस्यैकादशमे मासे मरणं परिकीर्तितम् ॥

15. सुवर्णरजतं मूत्रं पुरीषं वमते निशि ।

स्वप्ने स मासे दशमे प्रयाति यममन्दिरम् ॥

16. रक्षः प्रेतपिशाचानां यक्षाणामपि दर्शनात् ।

अतीन्द्रियाणामन्येषां नवमे मरणं द्रुवम् ॥

17. दीर्घं जायते यस्य बहुसम्पन्नभोजिनः ।

अनश्नन्तोऽपि पीनत्वमष्टमे स्यात्स मृत्युभाक् ॥

no reference to food or fasting as the factor. Instead we have an additional mention of morbidity in the natural form of the man.

(7) Verse 10—‘He, whose whole foot appears to be split up or deformed in dust or mud, attains death in the seventh month.’¹⁸ This indication appears alike in Devala 7, VP 5, and MP 7, but with some difference in the wording. The *Viṣṇudharmottara* adds the words *asakalaṃ* and *vikṛtaṃ* for *padam*, whereas the other texts have *agrataḥ prṣṭato vā’pi* (MP has *pārṣṇyām pādasyāgre*). The MP verse is slightly more akin to the *Viṣṇudharmottara* verse.

(8) Verse 11—‘The twice-born, on whose head verily perch crow, hawk and other carnivorous birds, is declared to die in the sixth (month).’¹⁹ This indication is recorded by Devala 8, MP 8 as well. The *Viṣṇudharmottara* inserts the word *dvijāḥ* and paraphrases *śyena* for *grddhra*. Of the three texts Devala is the nearest. The VP replaces *khagāḥ* for *pakṣiṇaḥ*, while the MP has several changes; it uses *vāyasaḥ* for *kākaḥ* and inserts two new words *Kākolaḥ* and *nīlaḥ*.

(9) Verse 12—‘He, from whose body dust, having the colour of the powder of cowdung, is rubbed off (and who sees) the morbid form of the shadow of his own body, attains death in the fifth (month).’²⁰ Its parallel is to be seen in Devala 9, MP 9 and VP 7. Of the three, Devala comes nearest to the present verse. The other two mention this indication for death in the fourth or fifth month. The first part of the indication, as given in the first line, also differs from what the other texts record, but here also Devala has a little more resemblance. It may be noted that the expression *gomayacūṛṇābham* can be traced in the account of *ariṣṭas* found in the medicinal texts.²¹

18. पदं चासकलं यस्य क्षण्डं विकृतमेव वा ।

पांसुकर्दमयोर्दृश्येत्सप्तमे मासि मृत्युभाक् ॥

19. क्रग्यादाः पक्षिणो यस्य मूर्ध्नि लीयन्ति वै द्विजाः ।

काकश्येनादयस्तस्य षष्ठे मरणमादिक्षेत् ॥

20. यस्य गोमयचूर्णमिं शरीरान्मुज्यते रजः ।

स्वदेहच्छायाविकृतिः पञ्चमे स तु मृत्युभाक् ॥

21. Caraka, Indriya, 12.3; Bhela, Indriya, 9.1.

(10) Verse 13—The indication is mentioned in a single line. It says that a man, having seen lightning in a cloudless sky, definitely dies in the fourth month.²² It has its parallel in Devala 10, MP 10 and VP 10. MP and VP mention it as referring to the person living for three or two months and record another premonitory sign in the first part of the second line. The second part of the first line in the three texts adds the detail that the lightning rests in the southern direction (*dakṣiṇāṇi diśamāśritam*). The first part of the line is completely identical with its counterpart in MP.

(11) Verse 14—‘The noble twice-born, who knows his *dharmā*, having seen the rainbow in water or the sky as non-existent, definitely dies in the third month.’²³ Devala 10 mentions a different premonitory sign for death in the third month. The first of the two indications noted by the *Viṣṇudharmottara* is recorded by Devala 12 as sign for death by the second month. MP 10 and VP 8 record it along with the preceding sign for death in two or three months.²⁴ The phrasing of the indication is nearer to that in Devala than the one found in VP.

16—‘If, without any disease, the eyes
e eyes appears to be dislocated and the
t brings death within a month.’²⁵ The
a month recorded in Devala, MP and
but, the indications under discussion are
? for a man whose life is over. Of the
balance in expression.

चतुर्थे त्रियते घुवम् ।

गगनं वा द्विजोत्तमाः ।

तृये त्रियते घुवम् ॥

seeing of the rainbow in the night.

। रोगं यदा भवेद् ।

यानभ्रंशो विधीयते ॥

वक्त्रं च मरणप्रदा ॥

effective. *Avaghatṭana* means agitation, stirring round. But the parallel passages have *śrauet* which means oozes or flows. In comparison with MP and VP passages would the second line refers to ears.

(13) Verse 17 (line a)—‘If a man smells foul odour from his own body, he dies within a fortnight’.²⁶ This indication is mentioned by MP 12 and VP 10 in greater details. In Devala 15 it is brief and is mentioned as a premonitory sign for death within twelve days.

(14) Verse 17 (lines b and c)—‘The very fortunate man, who does not see his own image in the eyes of others, verily sees Yama within twelve days.’²⁷ The indications for death after twelve days as listed by Devala, MP and VP differ from this. MP 23 and VP 21 later mention this very sign as indicating that the death of the person is imminent. In both these *Purāṇas* it is the second line of the verse which is parallel to the first line of the *Viṣṇudharmottara*.

(15) Verse 18—A man knowing *dharma*, who does not smell the odour of an extinguished lamp, definitely sees Yama (lit. the son of Sun) within a week.²⁸ None of the three texts, Devala, MP and VP, mentions any indication for death within a week. But both the *Purāṇas* list this sign later on (MP 23 and VP 20) as indicating imminent death.

(16) Verse 19—‘If the chest, feet and head of a person, immediately after bath or besmearing (with oil or unguent), quickly dries, his death is indicated after three days.’²⁹ The two *Purāṇas* do not mention any indication for death within three days. Devala does list one for this period, but it differs from the one mentioned by the *Viṣṇudharmottara*. This sign is listed by Devala and MP as indicating death respectively after a month and twelve days.³⁰ The wording of the indication is nearer to that in MP. However, all these three texts refer to a person taking his bath (*snātamātrasya*).

26. अश्वमासेन दुर्गन्धप्रभवं स्वशरीरतः ।

27. परचक्षुषि यश्छायामात्मनस्तु न पश्यति ।
स पश्यति महाभागा द्वादशाहेन वै यमम् ॥

28. निर्वाणदीपगन्धं तु यस्तु नाग्राति मानवः ।
सप्ताहेन तु धर्मज्ञाः पश्यत्यकसुतं द्रुवम् ॥

29. सद्यः स्नातानुलिप्तस्य हृत्पादशिरसां भवेत् ॥
क्षिप्रं संशोषणं तस्य त्र्यहान्मरणमादिशेत् ॥

30. VP 19 refers to the severe pain in heart after the person has taken his bath.

The reference to the person taking his bath and besmearing himself (*snātānuliptyasya*) occurs in the medicinal texts.³¹

(17) Verse 20—'If a person has red freckles on his cheeks and has morbidity in his colour, his death is ordained to occur within a day and a night.'³² The other three texts do not record any sign to indicate death after the period specified here. The sign of red boils (*piṭaka*) on the cheek (*gaṇḍa*), however, is recorded by Devala 16 and VP 23, by the first to indicate that the person will live for four days and by the second that the death is imminent. But the other sign of morbidity in colour is not mentioned by any of these texts. The medicinal texts do prominently mention morbidity of colour (*varṇavikṛti*) as a premonitory sign.³³

(18) Verses 21 and 22—'He, who does not hear the sound when the ears are closed with fingers, does not see the face in a stainless mirror and sees the agents (*puruṣas*) (of Yama) who have approached, is ordained to die immediately.'³⁴ Of the three indications, the first is recorded alike by Devala 18, MP 28 and VP 27, the MP passage being the nearest. The second indication also occurs in these three texts (Devala 13, VP 9 and MP 11), of which the first two are nearer to the *Viṣṇudharmottara* passage than the last one. But, in all the three texts it indicates death after a month. There is nothing in Devala to resemble the third indication. But MP 20 and VP 17 have a remote connection; they mention fierce *puruṣas* hitting the person with stones in dream, indicating imminent death.

(19) Verse 23—The verse is not properly phrased. It mentions premonitory signs for death after two days and thus does not appear in a proper sequence of enumeration. The most reasonable

31. Caraka, Indriya, 2.22; 5.16; 12.5; Bhela, Indriya, 11.19; Susruta, Sūtra, 33.10.

32. गण्डयोस्तिलकान् रक्तान्वर्णवैकुण्ठमेव ।

बहोरात्रेण मरणं पुरुषस्य समाप्स्यति ॥

33. Caraka, Indriya, 1.8-13, 17-23.

34. अङ्गुलिभ्यान्तु विहिते बोधे तु न शृणीषि यः ॥२१॥

शब्दे न पश्येत् मुखं निमित्ते पश्ये स्यात् ।

पश्येन्न पुरुषान्मायान्ततो मरणमाप्स्यति ॥२३॥

Vihite is possibly a mistake for *Viṣite*.

translation of the verse, as it is, will be : When the smoke on the head is destroyed, which may be caused by getting wet by water, and the bending (or breaking) of nose, death is ordained after two days'.³⁵ None of the three texts has a parallel verse. The author possibly tried to incorporate as many indications as possible and, in the process, did not care for repetition. We notice here three signs. The first is the appearance of smoke on the head of a person. It is mentioned by Devala 14 as indicating death after a fortnight. The second possibly refers to the hair not standing up even when wet with water. This occurs in Devala 18, VP 11 and MP 14, the first mentioning it, as in the *Viṣṇudharmottara*, to indicate death after two days. The third is only a revised form of the indication mentioned in verse 16 of the *Viṣṇudharmottara* discussed earlier. Thus, the present verse seems to be based on Devala.

The second part in the chapter dealing with *ariṣṭas* in the *Viṣṇudharmottara* is without any parallel in the other texts. This is because, whereas the other texts deal with *ariṣṭas* in connection with Yoga, the *Viṣṇudharmottara* emphasises their medicinal aspect. The *Viṣṇudharmottara* has given a wide coverage to topics falling within the scope of Āyurveda. In suffixing verses 24 to 33 to its account on *ariṣṭas*, it possibly wanted to emphasise its distinction from the other texts and to bring it closer to the medicinal texts.

The introductory verses 2 and 3 of the *Viṣṇudharmottara*³⁶ are clearly written after Suśruta, Sūtra, 30.3³⁷. They spell out the approach of the author of the *Viṣṇudharmottara*. He seeks to record signs expressed in abnormal changes in intelligence, senses and body. The medicinal concern is revealed further by verse 24 which refers to the approaching death of both a healthy and a sick person.

35. मूर्ध्मविनाशे तु जलाव्राद्धा तदुद्भवेत् ।

नासामङ्गने धर्मज्ञा दधहान्मरणमादिशेत् ॥

36. प्रकृतेर्विकृतिर्नूणां बुद्धीन्द्रियशरीरजा ।

अकस्माद् दृश्यते येषां तेषां मरणमादिशेत् ॥२

एतत्समासात् कथितं विस्तरोऽयमतः परम् ।

सूक्ष्मारिष्टावबोधार्थं तथा स्पष्टार्थमेव च ॥३

The text reads *pravṛtte* in place of *prakṛter* and *vikṛti* for *vikṛtir* in v. 2.

37. शरीरशीलयोर्यस्य प्रकृतेर्विकृतिर्भवेत् ।

तत्स्वरिष्टं समासेन व्यासतस्तु निबोध मे ॥

It is to be noticed that in the first part also the *Viṣṇudharmottara* omits many indications, which have a supernatural character, and emphasises symptoms in the form of changes in body, senses and intelligence.

Verses 24 to 33 refer to the sudden tendency on the part of the different senses to behave opposite to their normal character (*ceṣṭā-viparyaya*).³⁸ The *Aṣṭāṅgasāṅgraha* devotes chapter 10 of the *Sarīrasthāna* to indications of morbid behaviour (*vikṛtehāviññānīya*). But it does not have verses or expressions identical with those in the *Viṣṇudharmottara*. However, verses 26 to 28 of the *Viṣṇudharmottara* seem to present more elaborately and effectively what the

शब्दचेष्टाविपर्ययः ।

“ स्वस्थातुरशरीरिणाम् ॥ २४

चित्तोष्णस्य विपर्ययः ।

मिं तस्य जीवितम् ॥ २५

मीमिव पश्यति ।

क्षेत करस्थितम् ॥ २६

शमिव मेदिनीम् ।

मिन्दुमथातिथौ ॥ २७

लसूक्ष्म-विपर्ययम् ।

यते जीवितक्षये ॥ २८

ष्टानिष्टविपर्ययः ।

त्रिग्रहातीन्द्रियग्रहः ॥ २९

योपजायते ।

विपर्ययः ॥ ३०

ष्टसमागमः ।

प्राणसंक्षये ॥ ३१

सतमस्कोऽतिशीतलः ।

गतासूनां प्रजायते ॥ ३२

यादाहतानामशब्दता ।

पूर्णं नृणां गृहे ॥ ३३

Printed text in the first line of verse 25
place of *Kharan* वदे.

Aṣṭāṅgasāṅgraha says in verses 3 and 4.³⁹ Likewise, the idea contained in verse 33 of the *Viṣṇudharmottara* has its parallel in verse 7 of the *Aṣṭāṅgasāṅgraha*.⁴⁰ Indications detailed in verses 29 to 31 of the *Viṣṇudharmottara* are very briefly implied by the second line of verse 8 of the *Aṣṭāṅgasāṅgraha*.⁴¹

This same subject has been treated in the chapters entitled *indriyāṇika* in the *Carakasamhitā* (Indriya, ch. IV) and *Bhelasamhitā* (Indriya, ch. VII) which are identical except for minor variations in reading (possibly caused by the corrupt form of the text the *Bhelasamhitā*) and the absence in the *Bhelasamhitā* of verses 14 and 20 of the *Carakasamhitā*. Sūruta deals with this subject in chapter 30 of the *Sūtrasthana* entitled *pañcendriyārtha-vipratipatti* in which morbidity in respect of sound (verses 4-6), touch (verses 7-10), taste (verses 11-12), smell (verse 13) and sight (verses 15-23) are referred to. But there is no significant similarity in the details of the signs or the wording. We are inclined to identify the *Carakasamhitā* and *Bhelasamhitā* as the source from which the *Viṣṇudharmottara* derived its information for verses 24 to 33. The relevant portions in the *Aṣṭāṅgasāṅgraha*, except for verses 3 and 4, referring to morbidity in visual perception, are so brief and devoid of details that they could not have been the prototype for the *Viṣṇudharmottara* verses. Another reason for regarding the *Carakasamhitā* and the *Bhelasamhitā* as the prototype in emphasising this aspect of the *ariṣṭas* is the fact that they duly introduce the subject bringing out its significance (Caraka verses 5 and 6; Bhela verses 3 and 4), and also add a concluding verse to summarise the point (Caraka verse 26; Bhela verse 22). Both these texts⁴² alike have several verses on the morbidity of the five senses and list a large number of symptoms on whose basis the

39. घनीभूतमिवाकाशमाकाशमिव यो घनम् ।

अमूर्तमिव मूर्तं च मूर्तं वा मूर्तवत्स्थितम् ॥

तेजस्व्यतेजस्तद्वच्च शुक्लं कृष्णमसच्च सत् ।

अनेत्ररोगश्चन्द्रं च बहुरूपमलाम्बुधनम् ॥

40. मेघतोयीघनिर्घोषबीणापणववेणुजान् ।

शृणोत्यन्याश्च यः शब्दानसतो न सतोऽपि वा ॥

41. तद्वद्गन्धरसस्पर्शान्मन्यते यो विपर्ययात् ।

42. In the following discussion we have not referred to the verse in the *Bhelasamhitā* to avoid repetition, the *Carakasamhitā* being older and better known.

indications mentioned in the *Viṣṇudharmottara* could have been formulated, in some cases by using similar expressions. Thus, verse 25 of the *Viṣṇudharmottara* reminds us of verse 23 in the *Carakasamhitā*.⁴³ The *Carakasamhitā* has twelve verses on morbidity of visual perception⁴⁴, which could have inspired verses 26 to 28 of the *Viṣṇudharmottara*. Likewise, the *Carakasamhitā* has one verse each on the morbidity of taste⁴⁵ and smell⁴⁶, which could have formed the basis for the two verses (29 and 30) on this point in the *Viṣṇudharmottara*. Further, Verse 33 in the *Viṣṇudharmottara* can be matched by verse 19 of the *Carakasamhitā*.⁴⁷

We have not much to choose between the *Carakasamhitā* and the *Bhelasamhitā* for being regarded as the base for verses 24 to 33 in the *Viṣṇudharmottara*, because both have identical verses. Our preference for the *Carakasamhitā* is partially due to the fact that it is older of the two and has a better reputation as an authority on the subject. There is an additional consideration in favour

43. Indriyāṇika, IV. 23—

उष्णांछीतान् खरांछलक्षणान्मृदूनापि च दाहणान् ।

स्पृश्यान् स्पृष्ट्वा ततोऽन्यत्वं मुमूर्षुस्तेषु मन्यते ॥

44. We may mention in particular the following passages :

घनोभूतमिवाकाशमाकाशमिव मेदिनीम् ।

विगीतमुभयं ह्येतत् पश्यन् मरणमुच्छति ॥७

यस्य दर्शनमायाति मारुतोऽम्बरगोचरः ।

अग्निनर्पिाति चादीप्तस्तस्यायुःक्षयमादिशेत् ॥ ८

कृष्णं वा यदि वा शुक्लं निशां व्रजति सप्तमीम् ॥

मरीचीनसतो मेघान्मेघान् वाऽप्यसतोऽम्बरे ।

विद्युतो वा बिना मेघैः पश्यन् मरणमुच्छति ॥ १२

यश्च पश्यत्यदृश्यान् वै दृश्यान् यश्च न पश्यति ।

तावुभौ पश्यतः क्षिप्रं यमक्षयमसंशयम् ॥ १८

45. *Ibid*, IV. 22

यो रसाक्ष विजानाति न वा जानाति तत्त्वतः ।

मुखपाकादुते पक्वं तमाहुः कुशला नरम् ॥

46. *Ibid*, IV. 23, quoted above.

47. *Ibid*, IV. 19

अशब्दस्य च यः श्रोता शब्दान् यश्च न बुध्यते ।

द्वावप्येतौ यथा प्रेतौ तथा ज्ञेयौ विजानता ॥

of our suggestion. The *Carakasamhitā*, in view of the importance of the indications under discussion, includes some of them in its summary of the information in the earlier chapters, which it gives in chapter 12 (verses 40 to 61). It is significant that verse 58 in this narrative,⁴⁸ without any parallel in the *Bhelasamhitā*, matches verse 24 in the *Viṣṇudharmottara*. We may further note that a passage in the *puṣpitaka indriya* chapter (*Indriyasthāna*, 2) of the *Carakasamhitā*⁴⁹, though referring to the smell of the body of a morbid person (and not his morbid smell sense), employs expressions reminding us of lines 30 b and 31 a of the *Viṣṇudharmottara*. But chapter (II) entitled *puṣpīya* in the *indriyasthāna* of the *Bhelasamhitā* does not contain any passages similar to it.

But, the desire on the part of the author of the *Viṣṇudharmottara* to distinguish it from earlier texts mentioning *ariṣṭas* can be seen in the two new verses (31 and 32) inserted in the second part of its narrative, though their presence is not justified by the avowed scope specified in verse 24. They mention that in the case of imminent death there is a juxtaposition of fear and fortitude and at the time of death there is a breathing out.

Thus, we see that the chapter on *ariṣṭas* in the *Viṣṇudharmottara* is not based on any particular text. Being of direct relevance to a physician and his patient, *ariṣṭas* were first considered in all their details by texts on medicine. The Yoga school of philosophy adopted the account of *ariṣṭas* to suit its own requirements. It was in this context that the *ariṣṭas* are noted in the *Mahābhārata*, *Devala-dharma-sūtra*, *Vāyu-purāṇa* *Mārkaṇḍeyapurāṇa* and *Liṅga-purāṇa*. Of these the *Liṅga-purāṇa* copies the *Vāyu-purāṇa*. The account in the *Mahābhārata*, does not have any close resemblance with the *Viṣṇudharmottara* version. The first part of the account in the *Viṣṇudharmottara* has resemblances and borrowings alike from the *Devala-dharmasūtra*, *Vāyu-purāṇa* and *Mārkaṇḍeyapurāṇa*. It is not possible to choose one of these three as the source

48. शब्दः स्पर्शो रसो रूपं गन्धश्चेष्टा विचिन्तितम् ।

उत्पद्यन्ते शुभान्येव प्रलिकर्मप्रवृत्तिषु ॥

49. इष्टैर्वा यदि वाऽनिष्टैः स च पुष्पित उच्यते ॥ १०

समासेनाशुभान् गन्धानेकत्वेनाथवा पुनः ।

आजिघ्रैद्यस्य नात्रेषु तं विद्यात् पुष्पितं मिषक् ॥ ११

from which the *Viṣṇudharmottara* borrowed, though we find that on some details the *Devala-dharmasūtra* seems to have contributed a little more than the other two. We will not discuss here the possibility of all these three sources themselves deriving their information from a common source and to identify it.⁵⁰

In its account the *Viṣṇudharmottara* seems to have given a larger medicinal emphasis, borrowing expressions occurring in medicinal texts. The second part of its narrative is clearly outside the influence of the three texts under the Yogic tradition and was most likely drafted on the basis of the *Carakasamhitā* (and the *Bhelasamhitā*), though showing familiarity with the text of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* as well.

We may briefly correlate these inferences with the opinions expressed about the date of the composition of the *Viṣṇudharmottara*. A later date between A. D. 628 and 1000 was suggested by Winternitz.⁵¹ The most recent view of P. V. Kane⁵² also favours a date between A. D. 600 and 1000 with the possibility of passages being added in later periods. Earlier, Buhler had suggested that the text was composed before A. D. 500.⁵³ Basing themselves on the portions dealing with painting, Stella Kramrisch⁵⁴ has placed the text between the fifth and seventh centuries. On the basis of a fuller discussion of a wider range of evidence, R. C. Hazra dates the text between A. D. 400 and 500.

We are in general agreement with the view suggesting that the different portions in an encyclopaedic work of the nature of the *Viṣṇudharmottara* are to be assessed separately for determining their chronology and that in its Āyurvedic material the *Viṣṇudharmottara* was influenced mostly by the *Aṣṭāṅgasāṅgraha* of Vāgbhaṭa.⁵⁵ As the *Aṣṭāṅgasāṅgraha* is placed in about A. D. 550⁵⁶, the close of the

50. We are attempting it separately in another article.

51. *History of Indian Literature*, I, p. 580.

52. *History of Dharmasāstra*, Vol. V., p. 910.

53. *Indian Antiquary*, XIX (1890), p. 408.

54. *Journal of the Department of Letters*, XI, p. 3. She places it before Śaṅkarācārya.

55. R. G. Srivastava, *Op. Cit.*, pp. 17, 349.

56. P. V. Sharma, *Vāgbhaṭa-vivecana*, p. 356; *Āyurveda kā vai-jñānika itihāsa*, p. 156.

sixth century and the first quarter of the seventh century⁵⁷ will be generally acceptable as the date for portions which contain Āyurvedic material.

But chapter 238 of Khaṇḍa III of the *Viṣṇudharmottara* is evidently an exception to this general inference. It has to be dated after the *Devala-dharmasūtra*, *Vāyupurāṇa* and *Mārkaṇḍeya-purāṇa* on the one hand and the *Carakasamhitā* and the *Suśrutasamhitā* on the other. Following R. C. Hazra⁵⁸, chapter 43 of the *Mārkaṇḍeya-purāṇa* is to be dated later than A. D. 200 but before the latter half of the fifth century. According to Hazra the relevant portions of the *Vāyupurāṇa* are an improvement upon the *Mārkaṇḍeyapurāṇa* and hence are to be dated later still. He further suggests that they were interpolated after A.D. 400 when the *Vāyu* and *Brahmāṇḍa* were separated.⁵⁹ For the *Devaladharmasūtra* we favour the time-bracket c. 400 B. C. to A. D. 200.

Opinion is sharply divided on the question of the chronological stratification of the *Carakasamhitā*. Its *indriyasthāna* section, in which we find an account of the *ariṣṭas*, was not retouched by Dṛḍhabala. It was originally written by Agniveśa, the disciple of Ātreya, and was revised by Caraka. The Chronology Committee of the National Institute of Sciences of India, after a due consideration of all possible evidence, accepted A. D. 100 as the date for the composition of the *Carakasamhitā*.⁶⁰ The *Suśruta-samhitā* also had several stages of revision and elaboration. Whatever the date of the elder Suśruta, the later one, who revised the original text, is

57. R. C. Srivastava, *Op. cit.*, p. 17.

58. *Studies in the Purāṇic Records on Hindu Rites and Customs*, pp. 10-11. This agrees with Pargiter, *Mārkaṇḍeya-Purāṇa* (English translation), Introduction, p. xx.

59. *Ibid*, p. 15. S. N. Roy, *Historical and Cultural Studies in the Purāṇas*, pp. 197-208 supports Hazra on the basis of the Buddhist influence, sectarian nature and incongruous and inconsistent plan of chapters 11 to 20. He, however, holds that even uptill the seventh century the *Vāyu* and *Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇas* formed one text.

60. R. C. Majumdar in D. M. Bose, S. N. Sen and B. V. Subbarayappa (Ed.), *A Concise History of Science in India*, p. 223. Caraka was the name of a physician at the court of Kaṇiṣka. P. V. Sharma, *Āyurveda kā vaijñānika itihāsa*, p. 113 places Caraka in the second century B. C.

generally placed in the second century A. D.⁶¹ The Chronology Committee of the National Institute of the Sciences of India has decided to place Nāgārjuna's redaction of the text between the third and fourth centuries A. D.⁶² The *Bhelasāṃhitā* acquired its present form in the seventh century.⁶³ But it clearly contains much that is old and authentic, going back to the period of the *Brāhmaṇas*.⁶⁴ The late date for the revision of the text does not affect our chronological discussion as the *Viṣṇudharmottara* chapter does not show any exclusive connection or dependence on the *Bhelasāṃhitā*.

Considering all this we need not push the date of the chapter on *ariṣṭa* in the *Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa* to the sixth-seventh centuries. A date between A. D. 450 and 500 will meet the requirements of the case.

61. P. V. Sharma, *loc. cit.*, p. 75.

62. R. C. Majumdar, *loc. cit.*, p. 223.

63. P. V. Sharma, *loc. cit.*, p. 131.

64. R. C. Majumdar, *loc. cit.*, p. 222.

KṚṢṆA AS A PORTION OF THE SUPREME*

By

NOEL SHEETH

[विष्णुपुराणे भागवते च कृष्णस्य स्वरूपं नैकप्रकारेण प्रदर्शितम्—स ष्वचिद् अंशावतारः, ष्वचित् पूर्णावतारः, ष्वचित् सर्वावतारबीजभूतः, ष्वचित् पुनरंशांशभूत इत्येवंरूपेण बहुधोपवर्णितः । यद्यपि अंशप्रतिपादक-वचनानि बहुसंख्यकानि, तथापि व्याख्यातृभिस्तानि तथा व्याख्यातानि यथा कृष्णस्य सर्वातिशायिता सर्वकारणता वा न खण्डिता स्यात् ।

निबन्धलेखकेन व्याख्यातृमतानां समीक्षा कृता विस्तरेण; प्रतिपादितं च महता यत्नेन यद् व्याख्यातृणां व्याख्यानानि (यानि कृष्णस्य सर्वातिशायितां प्रतिपादयन्ति) प्रायेण क्लिष्टकल्पनारूपाणि, अयुक्तिदृढाणि च । लेखकमते कृष्णस्वरूपनिदर्शकानि पौराणिकमतानि स्वस्वसंप्रदायनियतानि; तानि यथा-कालं च समादृतानि पुराणकारैः । अर्वाचीने काले वैष्णवाचार्यैः कृष्णस्य सर्वकारणता सर्वातिशायिता च अनृजुभिरुपायैरपि प्रतिपादिता । अत्यन्तार्वा-चीने ब्रह्मवैवर्तपुराणे खल्वस्य मतस्य प्रतिपादनं महता कण्ठेन कृतमिति दृश्यते ।]

Both in the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* (ViP) and the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* (BhP), Kṛṣṇa is identified with the supreme Being.¹ In fact, in the BhP, Kṛṣṇa is distinguished from the gods, seers and other descents (*avatāra*), who are merely portions (*aṁśa*) or smaller parts

* Paper presented at the Fifth World Sanskrit Conference, Varanasi, October, 1981.

The names of the commentators of the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* frequently referred to are abbreviated thus : GD=Giri-dharalāla, GS=Gaṅgāsahāya, JG=Jīva Gosvāmin (His three commentaries : Ks=*Krama-sandarbhā*, Vt=*Vaiṣṇava-toṣiṇī*, Bks=*Brhat kṛṣṇasandarbhā*), RR=Rādhāramāṇa-dāsa, SD=Śukadeva, ŚS=Śrīdhara Svāmin, VB=Valla-bha, VC=Viśvanātha Cakravartin, VD=Varṇasīdhara, VJ=Vijayadhvaṇa, VR=Virarāghava.

1. Eg., ViP 5. 1. 34-35; 18.53; 23. 32. BhP 10. 10. 33; 13. 55; 16. 40; 28 6; 48.19; 84.20; 85.39. Cf. my doctoral thesis, "The Divinity of Kṛṣṇa according to the *Harivamśa*, the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* and the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*", (Harvard University, 1980), pp. 143-145, 149-154.

(*kalā*) of the *Puruṣa*, but Kṛṣṇa is the Lord (*bhagavān*) himself (1.3.28). However, in several passages in the ViP and the BhP, he is described as a descent of a part (*aṁśa*) of the supreme Light [i. e., Brahman] or of Viṣṇu or of the Lord (*bhagavān*).² Moreover, he is even referred to as a part of a part (*aṁśāṁśa*, *aṁśa-bhāga*).³ In this paper I shall analyse the various attempts by commentators to explain away Kṛṣṇa's being considered as a portion of the Supreme.

(i) Kṛṣṇa as a part in the Viṣṇu Purāṇa

I shall first briefly deal with the ViP, and then take up the BhP for a detailed consideration.⁴ ŚS, on ViP 5.1.2, maintains that Kṛṣṇa is the supreme Brahman, but is called a portion because he descends in the limited form of a human being. Ratna-
P 5.1.2-3, points out that the terms
'portion' are used metaphorically due to
limited. But it is not that Kṛṣṇa's
to have a universal form, to possess

the ViP : 1.2 and 32; 2.4; 7.47; 17.2
3; 23.24; 29.25; in the BhP : 2.7.26;
2; and from Book 10 : 1.2; 2.18 and
.27; 38.32; 41.46; 43.23; 48.24.

.9 and 16; 10.10.35.

the ViP : (1) *Viṣṇupurāṇam* with the
idhara called *Svaparakāśa*, ed. by Jīva-
1, Calcutta : Sarasvati Press, 1882;
am, with the commentary of Ratna-
called *Vaiṣṇavākūṭacandrikā*, Bombay,

For the BhP I have used : (1)
vata-tātparyā-nirṇaya ed. by Bannanje
va-mūla granthāḥ, vol. 3, Udupi : Sarva
ormittee, 1980.

n with the commentary of Gaṅgā-
ārthaprakāśikā śikā, ed. by Pāṇḍeya
res : Paṇḍit Pustakālaya, Sāṁvat 2002

rahaṭpurāṇam with various commenta-
āṅkara Śāstrī, Vols. 1.9 and 11-12,
avata-vidyāpīṭha, Sāṁvat 2022 [1965]
3], for references other than Bk. 10;
n *Dakṣaśāstrī skandhaḥ*, with several
., ed. by Śrī Nityasvarūpa Brahma-
Devakinandana Press, Sāṁvat 1963-
Bk 10,

all powers and to be the Lord himself. With regard to Kṛṣṇa's being called a 'portion of a portion', ŚS, on ViP. 5.1.3, offers the following explanation: Viṣṇu is, as it were, the portion of the highest Brahman, and when Viṣṇu descends in the form of a human being, the latter form is, as it were, the portion of Viṣṇu. In this sense, Kṛṣṇa can be regarded as a portion of a portion.

(ii) Kṛṣṇa as a part in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa

Kṛṣṇa is the Lord himself

Taking up the BhP, let us first consider 1.3.28 *atē. cāṁśakalāḥ puṁśaḥ kṛṣṇas tu bhagavān svayam*. Some commentators state that an *aṁśa* is a more important part than a *kalā*, and many more distinguish Kṛṣṇa, the Lord, from the *aṁśas* and *kalās*.⁵ JG points out that the word 'tu' distinguishes Kṛṣṇa from all the *aṁśas*, *kalās* and the *Puruṣa*. Or the word 'tu' taken in the sense of 'exclusively', indicates that the statement 'Kṛṣṇa is the Lord himself' is an emphatic and exclusive (*sāvadhāraṇā*) *śruti* which supersedes all other *śrutis*.

JG argues that Kṛṣṇa, the subject (*anuvādyā*) of the sentence, was already mentioned as the twentieth *avatāra* (1.3.23), while the Lord (*bhagavān*), the predicate (*vidheya*), is mentioned only here (1.3.28). So, in accordance with the rule that the predicate should not be uttered without mentioning the subject, it is Kṛṣṇa who is the Lord, and not the Lord who manifests himself as Kṛṣṇa.⁶ In this connection, however, it should be noted that in 1.3.23⁷ the Lord is already mentioned as a subject there. The word '*svayam*', JG continues, also points to the fact that Kṛṣṇa is not a manifestation of the Lord, nor is Kṛṣṇa's being the Lord a superimposition (*adhyāsa*).⁸

According to JG one should not consider Kṛṣṇa as an [ordinary] *avatāra* even though he is mentioned as one in the context (*prakaraṇa*) of *avatāras* (1.3.23), for the later statement that he is the Lord cancels the previous one in accordance with the principle

5. ŚS, GD, GS, JG (Ks), RR, SD, VB, VC, VD, VJ and VR.

6. VC also mentions this.

7. *rāma-kṛṣṇāvītī bhuvo bhagavān aharad bharam*.

8. So also VC. Madhva also points out that *svayam* refers to the ultimate (*mūlarūpin*) Lord himself.

that what is mentioned earlier has less force than what is mentioned later. Or the statement 'Kṛṣṇa is the Lord himself', being considered a *śruti*, sublates the statement of his being an *avatāra*, for the latter is only a *prakaraṇa*, which has lesser force than a *śruti*. VC and GS use the same argument to invalidate passages that speak of Kṛṣṇa as a portion of the Supreme, by asserting that they are merely *prakaraṇas* or *liṅgas*. They add that the *śruti* 'Kṛṣṇa is the Lord himself' is a *paribhāṣā-sūtra*, i. e., an assertion, which, although occurring in one place, illuminates the whole *śāstra* [the BhP], like a lamp in a house. It is mentioned once only and is not repeated. Thus, according to JG, Kṛṣṇa's being mentioned as an *avatāra* refers to his descent in his essential character (*svaṛūpa*) into phenomenal glory (*prākṛta-vaibhava*) in order to generate a special bliss in his own servants.⁹ As VC puts it, it is in order to bestow his grace.

Kṛṣṇa as a part

Let us now examine how the various commentators attempt to reconcile the passages of the BhP which speak of Kṛṣṇa as a part of the Supreme with the belief that Kṛṣṇa is the Lord himself.¹⁰ The first argument is that such passages cannot be taken literally because otherwise they would contradict the principal statement that Kṛṣṇa is the Lord himself.¹¹ The mention of

9. JG has further discussion on this topic in his *Krama-sandarbhā*. See S. K. De, *The Early History of the Vaiṣṇava Faith and Movement in Bengal*, 2nd ed., (Calcutta : Firma K. L. Mukhopadhyaya, 1961), pp. 314-325. Incidentally, in his Ks, JG states that, since Balarāma is mentioned in the company of Kṛṣṇa in 1.3.23, Balarāma too is not a part of the Puruṣa. But JG himself, as we shall see later, at times refers to Balarāma as a portion of the Supreme.

10. The commentators do not explain away every single instance. At times they are silent. Eg., Madhva on most of the passages; VJ on 10.1.2; ŚS, VJ, JG (Ks and Vt) on 10.2.16; JG (Ks) and Sudarśanasūtrī on 10.2.18; ŚS, VJ, SD, on 10.2.41; ŚS, JG (Ks and Vt), VJ on 10.10.35; ŚS, VJ and Sudarśanasūtrī on 10.20.48; ŚS, VJ, GS on 10.26.23; ŚS, VJ, JG (Ks) on 10.33.27; VJ on 10.38.32; ŚS, VJ, JG (Ks), VC, SD on 10.41.46; ŚS, VJ on 10.43.23; JG (Ks and Vt), VJ on 10.48.24; ŚS, VJ and Sudarśanasūtrī on 11.7.2.

11. ŚS, VD, VR, VC, GD, GS on 2.7.26; see RR on 3.2.15; GD on 4.1.59; JG (Vt), VR, GS on 10.1.2.

Kṛṣṇa as a part-manifestation is due to the limited perception of ordinary people,¹² or to foster Devakī's and Yaśodā's maternal affection,¹³ or he takes on a limited form, as it were, to show his grace to his devotees.¹⁴

Often the instrumental (e. g. *amśena*) is interpreted to mean 'together with' some other being which is considered to be a part or a part of a part. For example, Kṛṣṇa descended together with Balarāma, who is a portion of the Supreme.¹⁵ Kṛṣṇa is also said to be accompanied by other portions such as Saṅkarṣaṇa, Pradyumna and Aniruddha,¹⁶ *Puruṣa* and others,¹⁷ parts like Matsya, Kūrma, Varāha,¹⁸ Brahmā, Rudra, etc.¹⁹ the portions of the *devas* who descended among the Yadus,²⁰ Yudhiṣṭhira, Arjuna and others,²¹ the cowherds, Yādavas and others,²² *Prakṛti*;²³ or they are simply called his portions without be specified.²⁴

At times the instrumental is interpreted to mean 'by means of', but without implying that Kṛṣṇa is a portion. Thus Kṛṣṇa descends by means of (the knowledge in the form of) his decision (*saṅkalpa*) to be born, the decision being considered as an *amśa* or

12. ŚS, JG (Vt) on 10.1.2; VB on 10.26.23; see also SD on 10.26.23; VC, SD, GS on 10.43.23.

13. VC on 10.2.9.

14. ŚS, GS on 10.2.18.

15. ŚS, VD, VR, SD, VB on 2.7.26; VR, SD, GD on 3.2.15; JG (Ks and Vt), VR, GS on 10.1.2; VR on 10.2.9; JG (Vt), VC, GS on 10.2.41; VR on 10.10.35; Sanātana Gosvāmin, JG (Vt and Bks), VR, VB, VC, Kiśoriprasāda, Dhanapatisūri, SD, GS, on 10.33.27; ŚS, VR, VC, GS on 10.48.24; VD, RR, VR, JG (Ks), VC, SD, GD, GS on 11.7.2.

16. GD, GS on 2.7.26.

17. VD, JG (Ks) on 3.2.15.

18. VD, VC on 3.2.15.

19. VC on 10.10.35; in 3.2.15, VD and VJ interpret the instrumental to mean 'by Brahmā', i. e., Kṛṣṇa was requested to descend by Brahmā who is a portion.

20. GS on 3.2.15.

21. SD on 10.33.27.

22. JG (Vt) on 10.41.46.

23. ŚS, GD, GS on 3.2.15. See also VB on the same.

24. VD, RR, JG (Ks) on 3.2.15. See also VB and Puruṣottama on the same.

kalā or *amṣa-bhāga*.²⁵ Other such portions are Kṛṣṇa's bliss (*ānanda*),²⁶ his *kriyā-śakti*,²⁷ his divine form (*dīvyā-vigraha*),²⁸ or Pradyumna.²⁹

VB offers some peculiar interpretations which no other commentator gives. For instance, Kṛṣṇa is referred to as a part because he occupies a section of the womb of Devakī.³⁰ Or Kṛṣṇa's descent is '*amṣena*' because he does not become manifest everywhere, but only in a particular part of the world, viz., the house of Devakī.³¹ Or Kṛṣṇa is the fullness, but he uses only that much part of himself as is required to save those whom he has come to save.³²

Kṛṣṇa and Balarāma as parts

Some passages indicate that both Kṛṣṇa and Balarāma are portions of the Supreme. Let us observe some of the interpretations offered by the commentators in this regard. One is that Kṛṣṇa takes on two forms, viz., Kṛṣṇa and Balarāma, by dividing his own form (*mūrtibheda*). But this does not mean that Kṛṣṇa is only a part. It is the same whole that manifests itself in two forms.³³ Another explanation is that the term 'part' is properly applicable to Balarāma, but it is applied to Kṛṣṇa by the 'maxim of the umbrella' (*chatrinyāya*).³⁴ In 10.43.23 it is because of the 'goddess of speech' (*gīrdevī*), and because Vasudeva, in whose house Kṛṣṇa descended, is considered as a part that the word 'part' is used.³⁵ In 10.20.48, the term '*kalābhyām*' is given the following meanings: Consciousness (*cit*) and bliss (*ānanda*),³⁶ the sun and

25. SD on 2.7.26 and on 10.38.32; GS on 10.41.46; VR on 10.1.2, 10.2.16 and 18, 10.2.41, 10.10.35, 10.33.27, 10.38.32, 10.41.46, 10.43.23, 10.48.24.
26. VB on 10.38.32.
27. VB on 10.41.46.
28. VR. on 10.1.2.
29. See VB on 10.1.2. and 10.2.41.
30. VB on 10.2.41. See also 10.41.46.
31. VB on 10.1.2.
32. VB on 10.43.23.
33. ŚS, JG (Ks), GS on 10.38.32; GS on 10.41.46.
34. VR, SD on 10.20.48; VR, SD, GS on 10.43.23.
35. JG (Vt) on 10.43.23.
36. VB on 10.20.48.

the moon;³⁷ when construed with 'hareḥ', which means the moon, the two *kalās* are the phases of the moon;³⁸ they are the two *avatāras*, Kṛṣṇa and Balarāma, without implying that Kṛṣṇa is a part;³⁹ the two hairs (i. e., symbolically Kṛṣṇa and Balarāma) with which the Lord descends.⁴⁰ These two hairs are referred to in 2.7.26, where it is said that the one with the white and black hair (*sitakṛṣṇakeśa*) was born by a part (*kalā*) of himself. Referring also to ViP 5.1.59-60, several commentators⁴¹ point out that these two white and black hairs symbolize Balarāma and Kṛṣṇa respectively. VB thinks '*sitakṛṣṇakeśa*' refers to Saṅkarṣaṇa, but feels that the four-fold [*vyūha*] Lord is suggested. JG maintains that the word *keśa* (hair) does not indicate a part (*aṁśa*), but it rather means lustre (*aṁśu*). By displaying his two *keśas*, Nārāyaṇa showed his two lustres, viz., Vāsudeva and Saṅkarṣaṇa.

Explanation of compound words

Since the hair may suggest that Kṛṣṇa is a part, some of the commentators⁴², notably VD, go to great lengths, giving several alternative interpretations of the words *kalayā sitakṛṣṇakeśa* (2.7.26), using all their grammatical skill. For instance, (1) According to VC, VD and GD, *sita* is Śiva, *kṛṣṇa* is Viṣṇu, *ka* is Brahmā, which yields *sitakṛṣṇaka*. Then, they continue, Kṛṣṇa is the lord (*īśa*) of these three (*teṣāṃ*), so that we finally get *sitakṛṣṇakeśa*. (2) Or *kalayā* is taken to mean 'skilfully' and *sitakṛṣṇakeśa* is interpreted to mean the one who has bound (*sita*) his black hair.⁴³ (3) Or in VD's somewhat different interpretation, which keeps the above meanings of *kalayā* and *sita*, the term *kṛṣṇa* in the compound *sitakṛṣṇakeśa* is interpreted to mean 'of Kṛṣṇā' (*kṛṣṇāyāḥ*), i. e., of Rādhā, so that *kalayā sitakṛṣṇakeśa* means 'the one who has skilfully tied the hair of Rādhā'. (4) Or according to SD it means the one who has partly (*kalayā*) white and black hair. (5) Or, according to

37: SD on 10.20.48.

38: VC, GS on 10.20.48.

39: GS on 10.20.48.

40: VB on 10.20.48. For his understanding of these two hairs see his comment on 2.7.26.

41: Eg., ŚS, VR, JG (Ks), VC.

42: VD, VC, SD, GD, JG.

43: Rūpa Gosvāmin in his *Bhagavatāmṛta* as quoted by VC. See also a partly similar interpretation by GS.

VD, *kalayā sita*, taken as a vocative in which *sita* means 'old', is interpreted to mean 'O old partial *avatāra*', and is addressed to Nārada. The remaining *kṛṣṇakeśa* (the black-haired one) refers to Kṛṣṇa. (6) Or VD takes the negative 'a' from *kalayā* to yield *asita* when prefixed to *sita*, and *asita* is interpreted to mean *adharma*. Then *kṛṣṇaka* is interpreted as 'the one who removes', from *karṣati*=*uddharati*. The final element, *śa*, means lord or protector. So *asitakṛṣṇakeśa* means the one who is the protector of those who remove *adharma*. (7) VD further outdoes himself in the following interpretation. *Kalayā* is taken as a nominative fem. ending word, and is analysed as 'ka', meaning 'water', plus 'layā', meaning that which dissolves (*ke=jale liyate iti*), so that *kalayā* means 'one who dissolves into the water', and the one who thus dissolves is supposed to be the earth. Now the one which is attached (*sita*) to that earth (*kalayā*) is the Govardhana mountain. The term *kṛṣṇa* is explained to mean the one who lifts (*karṣati*=*uddharati*) the Govardhana mountain. He has still to explain the last element, viz., *keśa*, which is interpreted to mean 'the one who lies (*śete*) in the water (*ke=jale*), i. e., Viṣṇu. Hence *kalayā sitakṛṣṇakeśa* comes to mean 'Viṣṇu who lifts the Govardhana mountain that is attached to the earth'. There are many more permutations and combinations, but these are sufficient to give an idea of how the commentators proceed. Another compound '*acyutāṁśaḥ*' (the portion of Acyuta), in 10.2.18 is interpreted by SS, JG (Vt), VC, SD and GS to mean 'the one who is not deprived of his parts' (*cyutirahitā āṁśa aiśvaryaḍayo yasya*), i. e., *acyutāṁśaḥ* means 'the integral one', 'the complete one'.⁴⁴

Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna as parts

In 4.1.59, two parts (*āṁśa*) of the Lord Hari, interpreted to refer to Nara and Nārāyaṇa, are said to have come (*āgata*) as the two *Kṛṣṇas*, interpreted to mean Arjuna and Kṛṣṇa. According to VR, Nara and Nārāyaṇa descend in the form (*rūpa*) of Arjuna and Kṛṣṇa. But most of the commentators explain that Nara and Nārāyaṇa enter Arjuna and Kṛṣṇa, maintaining, however, that while Nara enters Arjuna with his *avastā*, Kṛṣṇa is Nārāyaṇa

44. See also a similar explanation by VB. VJ interprets the compound as the *āṁśa* of Hari, but says that the word *āṁśa* here is only a reference to Kṛṣṇa's black hair (See 2.7.26).

himself.⁴⁵ SD distinguishes three Nārāyaṇas. The Primal Nārāyaṇa, who is Kṛṣṇa himself; the second, who is the Puruṣa; and the third, who is a part (*aṁśa*) of the *Puruṣa*, descends as the seer Nārāyaṇa in the family of Dharma. Now we are faced with the problem, viz., who is this Kṛṣṇa into whom Nārāyaṇa, the *aṁśa* of Hari enters. It seems to me that VC, VD and RR had this question in mind when they claimed that the two *aṁśas* (parts), Nara and Nārāyaṇa, enter Arjuna and Kṛṣṇa, who are their *aṁśins* (wholes or sources). In order to defend their position that Kṛṣṇa is the *aṁśin*, and not the *aṁśa*, they are forced to also make Arjuna an *aṁśin*. RR states that, since Arjuna is the companion of Krishna, Arjuna, is an *aṁśin* of Nara, who is his *aṁśa*, yet it is Nara who enters as an *āveśa* into Arjuna just as rivers enter into the ocean. So in order to preserve Kṛṣṇa's being an *aṁśin*, they even go to the extent of making Arjuna too an *aṁśin*. But they have to immediately recant and say that Nara enters Arjuna by his *āveśa*, while at the same time they want to maintain that Kṛṣṇa is Nārāyaṇa himself, or superior to Nārāyaṇa as Puruṣa and as the seer.

Different construing of words

We have seen some examples of how the commentators divide and connect various parts of compound like *sitakṛṣṇakeśa*. Let us now see some examples of how the commentators construe words differently so as to show that Kṛṣṇa is not a portion (*aṁśa*). In 10.1.2 instead of construing '*aṁśena*' with '*avatīrṇasya*', VC connects it with '*viṣṇoḥ*', interpreting Viṣṇu to be an *aṁśa* of Kṛṣṇa as present in Vaikuṇṭha.⁴⁶ Alternatively, VC connects '*aṁśena*' with '*śaṁsa*' to yield the meaning 'tell me partially the deeds of Kṛṣṇa', as no one can relate them fully.⁴⁷ In 10.2.16 instead of linking '*aṁśabhāgena*' with '*āveśa*', VR supplies '*jātasya*' to agree with '*ānakadundubheḥ*' and construes '*aṁśabhāgena*' with '*jātasya*'. So the Lord entered the mind of Vasudeva (Ānakadundubhi), who was born as a part of the *devas*, who, in turn, are parts of the Lord. Hence *aṁśabhāga* is interpreted to mean 'part of a part', but it refers to Vasudeva, not to Kṛṣṇa. In 10.2.41, instead of connecting

45. So also Madhva.

46. *tatrāvatīrṇasya vīryāṇi kathaya. Kasya, aṁśena viṣṇoḥ, yaḥ khalvaṁśena vaikunṭhe viṣṇur bhavati, yasyaikā mśo viṣṇuḥ tasya pūrṇasyetyarthaḥ.*

47. This construction is also mentioned by SD and GS.

'*amśena*' with '*kukṣigataḥ*', JG (Vt) supplies '*bhavet*' to go with '*bhavāya*' and relates '*amśena*' with '*bhavāya bhavet*'. So he derives the following sense: That Kṛṣṇa, who could bring about our welfare by his parts like Matsya, Aśva, etc., has himself entered your womb, is indeed fortunate. In 10.33.27 instead of construing '*amśena*' with '*avatīrṇaḥ*', several commentators⁴⁸ read '*amśena*' with '*jagadīśvaraḥ*', saying that he is the Lord of the world, viz. Viṣṇu, by a part of himself, but he himself has his full glory. Similarly, JG(Vt), in 10.41.46, construes '*amśena*' with '*jagataḥ kāraṇam*', indicating that Kṛṣṇa is the cause of the world by a part of himself. In 10.20. 48, VB, instead of taking '*kalābhyām*' with '*hareḥ*,' reads '*bhūḥ nitarāṁ hareḥ*, i. e., earth which belongs entirely to Hari; and he adds that it is Saṅkarṣaṇa who is the part (*kalā*). JG (Vt and Ks), VC, SD and GS divide '*kalābhyām*' into *kalā* and *ābhyām*, understanding *kalā* not as a part but as *śakti* (power), which is the earth. So we obtain the following: Hari's *kalā*, viz., his power, namely the earth, shone with these two (*ābhyām*), viz., Kṛṣṇa and Balarāma. VD in 11.7.2, instead of construing *amśena*, with *avatīrṇaḥ* links it with '*niṣpāditam*, and connects '*aśeṣataḥ* with '*avatīrṇaḥ* so that the resulting meaning is: I have partially accomplished the task entrusted to me by the gods for which I have descended fully. The work is only partially completed because the destruction of the Yadu clan still remains to be done.

Kṛṣṇa as part of a part

In 10. 2. 9. and 16, and 10. 10. 35 Kṛṣṇa can be considered to be a part of a part (*amśabhāga*). We shall now see how by giving different meanings to the element *bhāga*, the commentators free Kṛṣṇa from being called a portion. For instance, in 10. 2. 9, *amśabhāgena* is interpreted as 'by that nature (*svarūpeṇa*) in which there is the entry (*bhāga* = *bhājana* = *praveśa*) of the *amśas*.⁴⁹ Another explanation is 'by that form by which the *amśas*, i. e., the *jīvas* or Brahmā and others receive from Kṛṣṇa their share (*bhāga*) of

48. JG (Vt), Kīśorīprasāda, Rāmanārāyaṇa, Dhanapatisūri. See also VC. Kīśorīprasāda gives an alternative explanation according to which he supplies *api* and reads *amśena dharmādi-sthāpanāya iti kimuta svayam bhagavattvena iti*. (If *dharma* can be established even by a part, how much more by the entire Lord !)

49. JG (Vt and Ks), VC. See also a similar interpretation in VD.

the four *puruṣārthas* in accordance with their dispositions.’⁵⁰ VB interprets it to mean ‘by the division (*bhāgena* = *vibhāgena*) of the fourfold *aṁśas* of Puruṣottama, viz., Vāsudeva, Saṅkarṣaṇa, Pradyumna and Aniruddha’. He adds that the word ‘*bhāga*’ is used in the singular to show that the Pradyumna-part alone is involved in becoming a son. ŚS gives five alternative explanations, one of them being ‘he who presides (*bhāga* = *bhājate* = *adhitiṣṭhati*) over all by means of his powers (*aṁśaih* = *śaktibhiḥ*). In 10. 2. 16 SD interprets it as ‘in the form of being considered as a son (*bhāgena* = *putratayā bhajanīyena rūpeṇa*) of Devakī and Vasudeva, who are his parts (*aṁśa*). GS gives the following explanation in 10. 2. 35: By means of that full form in which there is the manifestation (*bhāga* = *prādurbhāva*) of the partial *avatāras* (*aṁśāvatārāṇām*).

Violence to the meaning of the word ‘part’

Finally we must mention that occasionally a commentator coolly ignores the word *aṁśa* or even takes it to mean *aṁśin*. Thus VR, dropping the word *aṁśa* in 10.26.33, just comments, ‘I consider Kṛṣṇa to be Nārāyaṇa himself’. JG (Ks and Vt) and VC take *aṁśa* here to mean not *āveśa* but *āveśin*, so that his comment reads, ‘I consider Kṛṣṇa to be the source of the power of Nārāyaṇa (*īacchaktyāveśinam*).’

We have thus seen the various techniques and devices used by the commentators, who even go so far as to offer rather far-fetched interpretations to defend what I think is a later understanding of the divine nature of Kṛṣṇa.⁵¹ The passages that speak of Kṛṣṇa as a part or a part of a part of the Supreme are so numerous, that it is difficult to accept that they are all superceded by the single statement that Kṛṣṇa is the Lord himself. It seems to me that we have here a remnant from an older tradition harking back to the time when Kṛṣṇa came to be identified with Viṣṇu, and as a descent (*avatāra*) of Viṣṇu, was considered his portion. Later, through the process of ‘sanskritization,’ Vaiṣṇavism became more Vedāntic,

50. JG, VC, GS, SD. See also SD on 10.10.35.

51. Nowhere does the BhP use the word ‘*pūrṇāvatāra*. On the other hand, the commentators frequently mention Kṛṣṇa’s being the ‘fullness’. Eg., VR on 1.3.28, says that Kṛṣṇa is *pūrṇāvatāra*. Jīva Gosvāmin, on 1.3.28, goes even further and states that Kṛṣṇa is the *avatarin*.

identifying Kṛṣṇa and Viṣṇu with Brahman, which manifests itself as Viṣṇu, Kṛṣṇa, Śiva and the like. But there are also passages in the BhP where Kṛṣṇa is not merely a manifestation of Brahman but is Brahman. These earlier and later traditions exist side by side in the Vaiṣṇava texts. In the BhP we find the *initial* attempt to deal with these conflicting traditions by explicitly asserting that, while other gods and beings are portions of the Puruṣa, Kṛṣṇa is the Lord himself. It is only in the tradition after the BhP—which is that of our commentators—that Kṛṣṇa's absolute supremacy is more fully established. For example, in the *Brahmavaivarta Purāṇa*⁵² Viṣṇu, who has a universe in every pore of his skin, is merely a sixteenth portion of Kṛṣṇa.

52. *Śrībrahmavaivartam Mahāpurāṇam*, 2 vols. (Bombay : Śrīveṅkaṭeśvara Press, Sāṃvat 1938 [1931], *Kṛṣṇa-janma-khaṇḍa* 5.110.

VEDIC—PURĀNIC VINCULUM

By

S. K. LAL

[वेदार्थव्याख्यानाय पुराणानि उपकारकाणि, पुराणगता विषया अपि सूक्ष्मरूपेण वेदेषूपलभ्यन्ते—इति द्वे मते निबन्धादौ उक्ते । ततश्चेदं प्रतिपादितं यद् वैष्णवशैवधर्मसंबद्धौ विष्णुशिवौ देवौ वेदे पुराणे च बहुधा उपवर्णितौ । वेदेतरपरम्परागतयोरनयो देवयो वेदेऽनुप्रवेशोऽनतिप्राचीने काले संजातः । वैष्णव-शैव-सम्प्रदाययोः परस्परद्वेषः सुप्रथित एव । पुराणवाङ्मये विष्णु-शिव-समन्वय-स्थापने विशिष्टः प्रयासोऽवलोक्यते ।

वैष्णव-शैव-धर्मयोः सम्मेलनाय समन्वयाय वा रात्रिनाम्नी काचिद् देवता (देवी) अभिकल्पिता, यस्या उल्लेख ऋग्वेदे दृश्यते । पुराणेऽपीयं देवी एतदर्थं वर्णिता—इति व्यक्तं प्रतीयते । एतद्विषये मधुकैटभ-शुम्भनिशुम्भ-तारकासुराख्यानानानि प्रमाणभूतानि—इति लेखकेन प्रदर्शितं विस्तरेण । एषु आख्यानेषु रात्रिदेवतायाः, तदवतारभूतदेवतायां च महिमा वर्णितः । तत्र योगनिद्रा-कालरात्रि-विष्णुमायारूपा अवतारा विष्णुपक्षीयाः; काली-कौशिकी-एकानंशा-रूपा अवताराश्च शिवपक्षीयाः ।

इयं रात्रिदेवता वेदिकी; अस्या बहूनि रूपाणि वेदे उक्तानि । इयं सौरी, सर्वप्राणिशरणभूता, दैत्यदानवादिसंबद्धा, दैत्यादिभयनिवारिका, प्रजननादि-शक्तिप्राचुर्यमयी च । पुराणे इयं रात्रि विष्णुसंबद्धा जाता सौरीत्वात्, शिव-संबद्धा जाता ध्वंसादिशक्तिमत्त्वात् ।]

The Purāṇas are the indispensable aids in the interpretation of the Vedas, their legends and mythology. Conversely, much of the Purāṇic legend and mythology is found, at least in its germinal stage, in the Vedic texts. That is, Vedic and Purāṇic mythology may be regarded as a two-way traffic. A number of Vedic divinities and the mythology connected with them are noticed to have found fuller expression in the Purāṇic texts. They have proliferated in different dimensions, and have encompassed around them many more elements of diverse nature.

Viṣṇu and Śiva, the two very important divinities of the Purāṇic amalgam, around whom Vaiṣṇavism and Śaivism revolve, are found in the oldest extant Veda, the Ṛgveda. But it is generally

averred that these two divinities were not so very important gods in the Vedic official religion. It is believed¹ that Viṣṇu was a "god of great eminence among the masses of the Aryan nomads and was not particularly liked by the orthodox family of the Vedic poets." He has the traits of phallus worship. On the other hand, Śiva was a very prominent god of pre-Aryan non-Vedic people.² It was only in the course of mutual assimilation and give and take between the Vedic and non-Vedic, that these two gods asserted themselves and came into prominence in the Vedic fold through two different channels: Viṣṇu through the super-imposition of solar traits on him and his consequent identification with Indra;³ and Śiva, also a pre-Vedic non-Aryan god connected with phallus worship, through Agni after having been re-christened as Rudra.⁴ However, this assimilation was not exercised without trimming much of the original nature and function of Viṣṇu and Śiva and making them conform to the Vedic thought-pattern.

In spite of this teleological inclusion of Śiva and Viṣṇu in the hierarchical Vedic religion, their pristine connection with fecundity, fertility, procreation, and phallus continued to survive in peoples' mind, the faint traces of which can be seen even in the Ṛgveda. In the course of time, when Vedism was on the decline and the original Vedic gods were being relegated to the background, and when Brāhmaṇism, precursor of modern Hinduism, was taking its firm roots, these two gods, Viṣṇu and Śiva, surfaced conspicuously and flourished in two different channels: Vaiṣṇavism and Śaivism.

A good part of the Purāṇic religion revolves round and reverberates with these two isms, which are seemingly diagonally opposite to each other. It is a well-known fact that these two isms were so different and distinct from each other that there used to be bitter conflicts between the followers of Vaiṣṇavism and Śaivism.⁵ It is in the Purāṇic literature that a noble attempt has been made to bridge the differences and, to a very appreciable extent, the Purāṇas gloriously brought in a kind of conciliation between the two conflicting isms by their ingenious methods of bringing these two gods together.

1. R. N. Dandekar, *Vedic Mythological Tracts*, 72.
2. Dandekar, o. c., 240.
3. Dandekar, o. c., 89.
4. Dandekar, o. c., 206; Gonda, *Visnuism and Sivaism*, 4.
5. Gonda, o. c., ch. V.

and making them complementary and not contradictory to each other. The lead given by the Purāṇic texts was followed by many Gupta and other kings and there thrived a number of temples where the idols of divinities belonging to both the isms were installed and worshipped amicably. This paper deals with one of the many measures by which this very important religious and social achievement was accomplished by the Purāṇas.

A study of some of the Purāṇic legends reveals that in order to have a sort of rapprochement between these two isms, the Purāṇic mythologists sought for a link divinity that could function as a vinculum between Vaiṣṇavism and Śaivism and found a divinity, namely, Rātri (RV 10.127) that served their purpose very well. But before we take up the characteristic features of this divinity which attracted Purāṇic mythologists to pick her up from among a host of many other important female divinities in the Vedic mythology, we should mention, in brief, three legends which contain in them the divinities of Vaiṣṇavism and Śaivism.

1. The legend of Madhu and Kaiṭabha⁶

In the Hindu cosmogonic speculations, it is believed that at the end of an eon the entire creation of Brahmā is destroyed by devastating floods. Viṣṇu goes into his cosmic sleep and so do all other gods. When Viṣṇu is still under the deep influence of Yoganidrā (cosmic sleep), Brahmā springs forth from his navel and appears on the lotus growing from the navel of Viṣṇu. Looking around the vacuum created by the surging waters, a flash of desire comes to his mind to create the universe anew. The moment he contemplated this re-creation, two demons, Madhu and Kaiṭabha, sprang forth from the ear of Viṣṇu and rushed to devour Brahmā. Brahmā looked around for succour but found no one except Viṣṇu who also was in slumber under the deep influence of Yoganidrā. Brahmā realised that unless Viṣṇu is released from the grip of Yoganidrā, and kills the demons, his very life was in danger to speak nothing of the re-creation. Thus thinking, he began to pray to Yoganidrā who had overpowered Viṣṇu. Being pleased by his supplications, Yoganidrā left Viṣṇu and stood aside. Viṣṇu got up and saw the two demons about to devour Brahmā. He challenged

6. Devīm. 1.49 f; DevībhP 1.6; 7.

them and a fierce fight between Viṣṇu and the two demons ensued. Mighty as the two demons were, Viṣṇu could not overpower them. Finding himself unable to vanquish the demons, he remembered his own potent power, namely, Viṣṇumāyā. She deluded the demons, and they were then killed by Viṣṇu. Brahmā then engaged himself in the job of re-creation of the universe.

The above legend brings forth two divinities, Yoganidrā and Viṣṇumāyā who helped Viṣṇu in annihilating the inimical forces of nature symbolized by Madhu and Kaiṭabha who hindered the smooth functioning of Brahmā. Undoubtedly these two female divinities are purely Purāṇic. But their counterpart, though in rudimentary form, can be found in the Vedic mythology. But before we do so, let us examine another legend mentioned in the Purāṇas.

2. The legend of Śumbha and Niśumbha⁷

These two fierce demons defeated Indra and all other gods. The gods retreated to the Himālayas. There, they implored Viṣṇumāyā to help them in their plight. At that moment Pārvatī, consort of Śiva, came there to bathe in the Gaṅgā. She enquired of the gods about the object of their prayer. With these words of hers, a girl instantly sprang forth from her body. She came later to be known as Kauśikī, having been born from the *kośa* (sheath) of Pārvatī. In the meantime, Caṇḍa and Muṇḍa, the two servants of the demons Śumbha and Niśumbha, saw the exceedingly charming Kauśikī and reported her presence to their masters. Śumbha became infatuated with her and sent a messenger to Kauśikī asking her to marry either him or his younger brother, Niśumbha. Kauśikī retorted that she would marry only the man who would conquer her in a fight. Hearing this, Śumbha despatched a mighty fighter, Dhūmrālocana, to bring the impudent girl to him. But the mighty Dhūmrālocana was killed by the slender Kauśikī. Thereafter, Śumbha and Niśumbha sent Caṇḍa and Muṇḍa to punish the impudent girl and to drag her to him. On approaching these two, the goddess became infuriated and there instantly sprang forth Kālī from her forehead. Again a fierce battle commenced between Kālī and the demons. The demons were killed by Kālī. Śumbha now became alarmed and realised the prowess of the Devi Kauśikī. He

7. Devī M. 5-10.

mobilized a huge army. In the meantime, the *śakti* of goddess Kauśikī sprang forth from her, and also *śaktis* of other gods, namely, Brahmā, Viṣṇu, Śiva, Kārttikeya, Indra, Varāha, and Nṛsimha also sprang forth, and joined her. The (nameless) *śakti* of Kauśikī sent Śiva as her emissary to the two demons to warn them that they must instantly release the gods and their property. And thus that *śakti* got the name Śivadūtī. The two demons did not heed the warning and attacked. There commenced a pitched battle between Śumbha and Niśumbha and other demons on one side and Kauśikī, Kālī, Śivadūtī, and all the *śaktis* of the gods on the other. Ultimately, all the demons were annihilated and the gods were released.

This legend brings forth the following divinities : 1. Pārvatī, 2. Kauśikī, 3. Kālī, 4. Śivadūtī, and 5. the *śaktis* of the gods. Before we discuss their origin and importance let us describe a third legend bearing on our topic.

3. The legend of Tārakāsura⁸

The mighty demon Tāraka tormented all the gods and usurped their property. The gods approached Brahmā for his advice and help. Brahmā assured them that a son of Śiva and Pārvatī would kill the demon. The gods retired. Brahmā then contemplated that in order to beget a son who would be able to kill the demon, Pārvatī had to practise rigorous penance in order to acquire physical strength to bear such a mighty child. He therefore contrived a plan. He asked the goddess Rātri to enter into the womb of Menakā, Himālaya's wife, and darken the colour of the child. After the marriage of Pārvatī with Śiva, Śiva would taunt her for her black complexion; she would feel offended, and resort to penance to change the black colour of her body. Another reason which Brahmā mentioned to Rātri for this kind of affinity between her and Pārvatī was that Rātri had to destroy the demons in the universe which she could accomplish only after coming into some kind of close contact with Pārvatī⁹, and thereby inheriting some of the demon-destroying quality of hers.

Thus instructed by Brahmā, Rātri covered the embryo of Menakā with her black hue and changed the colour of the child

8. DevīM. 5 f ; MatsyaP 152-155.

9. This indicates that Pārvatī belongs to the group of goddesses of inimical nature.


into black. Consequently Pārvatī was born black and was named by her parents as Kālī or Kālikā (blacky). In due course, Pārvatī and Śiva were married. As Brahmā had planned, Śiva once teased Pārvatī for her black complexion. Pārvatī felt offended and at once proceeded for penance to change her black colour. In the meantime, it so happened that a demon named Āḍi transformed himself into a damsel and entered the apartment of Śiva, forgetting that there was a curse on him that he would be killed whenever he transformed himself into any other form. Śiva killed the demon. However, when Pārvatī heard this, she misunderstood the whole affair and felt so disgusted and furious that wrath came out of her mouth in the form of a lion. Pārvatī was just about to enter the mouth of the lion, when Brahmā appeared before her and granted her the desired boon of obtaining a fair complexion. His plan had thus succeeded. The dark skin was at once separated from the body of Pārvatī and was converted into its original form of Rātri. She is known by the name of Kauśikī, for she was born from the sheeth (*kośa*) of Pārvatī. Brahmā further told her that since she had become blessed by the contact with Pārvatī and had partaken an *aṁśa* of hers, she would also be known as Ekānamśā.

This legend refers to three female divinities : 1. Pārvatī, 2. Rātri, and 3. Kauśikī or Ekānamśā.

The sum total of all the female divinities referred to in the above three legends is :

1. Yoganidrā,
2. Kālarātri,
3. Viṣṇumāyā,
4. Pārvatī,
5. Rātri,
6. Kālī,
7. Kauśikī,
8. Ekānamśā

The above mentioned divinities, on the basis of the three foregoing legends, can be tabulated as under :



From among these two groups, Parvatī was originally a mountain deity as her name (*Parvata* → *pārvata* → *pārvatī* = 'a mountain dweller') indicates. Most of the mountain and tribal deities were inimical goddesses and were worshipped to ward off and protect from demons, goblins, evil-spirits, etc. Conversely, such goddesses were also regarded as divinities of fertility and procreation. Similar must have been the case with Pārvatī. Further, Śiva was also a prominent tribal god of pre-Vedic India. Significant features of Śiva were (are) : 1. his connection with phallus, fecundity, and procreation, 2. his connection with demons, goblins, and evil-spirits, etc., i. e., malignant forces.

In the post-Vedic period, during the age of religious reawakening, and mass assimilation of independent divinities of different tribes and cults with the divinities of Neo-Brāhmaṇism, Pārvatī was united with Śiva because of their identical qualities. They became universal parents (*cf. jagataḥ pitarau vande pārvatīparamaśvarau*). That is to say, apart from their predominant position in Śaivism and Tāntrism, what is important from our point of view is that the demon-destroying and fertility-nature of Pārvatī still continues in her. It is Pārvatī who, in her incarnation as Kālī or Durgā or Kauśikī or Vindyaśiṇī, destroys the demons. Again, it is Pārvatī who is worshipped by women to obtain a husband and children (refer to Sītā's *gaurī-pūjana* in the *Rāmāyaṇa*).

The second divinity of the above group, namely Rātri, has a different story. She was originally a Vedic goddess.

There are altogether six hymns, one in the Ṛgveda (10. 127) and five in the Atharvaveda (3.10; 19.47-50) which celebrate Rātri. One important feature of Rātri in the Ṛgveda is that she is described as *jagato niveśini*, one who gives rest to the entire world (ṚV. 1.35.1; AV. 9.3.37; Khila 4.2.3). She provides a comfortable house (AV. 9.3.17; ŚB. 13.1.4.3) where all beings enjoy their nightly rest (ŚB. 10.3.1.16). People desire to sleep in her lap without any fear and worry, while she keeps a watch over men, their cows and horses (AV. 19.47.9). Even the gods sleep in her wide lap (ṚV. 10.70.6).

Another important feature of Rātri is her close connection with the sun. It is said that the sun possesses two forms : bright

and dark (RV. 10.37.3; 6.9.1). The one shines during the day, the other is dark during the night (RV. 1.215.5; VS. 33.38). Whatever light is in the sun, the same light is in the night also (AV. 4.18.1). Day and night are regarded as the two daughters of the sun (RV. 6.49.3).

The motherly aspect of Rātri is also hinted at in Vedic literature. She is the mother of Uṣas (RV. 1.113.3) and also of the sun (Rohita) (AV. 13.3.36).

Nevertheless, the fact that the demons, goblins, and evilspirits, etc. wander and become more active during the night has not remained unnoticed by the Vedic poets. She is prayed to protect people from all difficulties—human, natural, or supernatural. She is prayed to protect men from demons (Ppp. 13.10.2; AV. 8.2.20) and from the fierce creatures on the mountain (AV. 19.48.3). She is implored also to keep the wolves and the thieves away (RV. 10.127.6) and protect men from snakes, wolves, and other fierce animals (AV. 19.47.8; 50.1). It is important to note that in AV. 19.49.4, it is said that the shining Rātri has taken upon herself the splendour (*varcas*) of a lion, a tiger, a horse, and men and she transforms herself into many forms. In AV. 19.50.2, the poet wishes that the sharp-horned draught oxen of Rātri protect men in their difficulties.

Because of the belief that the inimical forces and demons prevail during the night, Rātri came to be regarded as an evil in Brāhmaṇic texts. The nightly darkness is the darkness of death (AB. 4.5; KB. 17.6.9; GB. 2.5.1). The demons and the Rākṣasas gather in the night (TS. 2.4.1.1; SB. 7.3.2.19). The Asuras delight in the night (ŚB 11.1.6.1). MārķP 48.1f mentions that while Prajāpati was engaged in meditation, the particles of darkness produced the Asuras. Prajāpati cast off that body of his which was composed of darkness. The body that was cast off by Prajāpati became night.

The above discussion would lead us to conclude that 1. Rātri has solar affinity; 2. she provides rest to all beings; 3. she is connected with demons, goblins, and evil-spirits, etc. from whom she protects; and 4. she has some traits of fertility and procreation.

In the post-Vedic Purāṇic literature, because of these prominent features of hers Rātri came to be associated with Viṣṇu and

Śiva. By virtue of her solar traits and motherly aspect she was aligned with Viṣṇu. On the other hand, her other traits, namely, her destroying the malignant forces plus her motherly aspect led her to be united with Śiva, a god of identical character and function.

The darkness of Rātri which has been referred to as being associated with the anarchic forces has been personified in the Purāṇic mythology as Kālarātri which does not seem different from Rātri in the Vedic mythology. This Kālarātri has her sway over the entire universe during the *pralaya*.¹⁰ The other feature of Rātri, i. e., her giving rest and bringing sleep to all beings, was personified as Yoganidrā.

By the time of the Purāṇas the solar character of Viṣṇu was fully developed and established. Rātri, because of her solar connection in the Ṛgveda, came to be associated with Viṣṇu. In the Ṛgveda, it is the solar god Indra, who with the help of his *māyā* brings forth the universe (ṚV. 6.47.18). But in the Purāṇas, it is the solar god Viṣṇu who is the lord of this *māyā*. Kālarātri is said to be Viṣṇumāyā (Devīm. 1.53; 5.13; KalikāP. 5.14; 6.9). The all-creative primeval goddess is known by the name of Viṣṇumāyā among the people (Devīm. 5.12) Without the consent, help, and cooperation of Viṣṇumāyā, nothing can be produced. This is clear from the legend of the demons Madhu and Kaiṭabha.


The selfsame Rātri has been associated with Pārvatī (Śiva-group) also as is evident from the legend of Śumbha and Niśumbha, and Tārakāsura. The reason for such association must have been her demon-destroying nature and that of Pārvatī with whom she was connected.

Whereas the solar affiliation of Rātri in the Ṛgveda was instrumental for her connection with Viṣṇu, her other features, viz., darkness and demon-destroying nature were conducive to her being associated with Pārvatī who too was originally an inimical goddess. That Brahmā asked Rātri to cover the embryo of Menakā so that Pārvatī is born black and thereby be endowed, due to the contact with Pārvatī, with an added vigour to destroy demons points towards this assumption.

10. Refer to Viṣṇu's cosmic sleep and emergence of Madhu and Kaiṭabha.

Conclusion :

On the basis of the above conspectus, we can have a clear picture of Rātri :



The Vedic Rātri thus served as a unifying force, a vinculum, in the Purāṇic mythology to bridge the gulf between Vaiṣṇavism and Śaivism because of her twofold character in the Ṛgveda :

1. Solar connection, and 2. demon-destroying nature. Viṣṇumāyā, Kālarātri, Yoganidrā, Kauśikī, Ekānāmśā, Kālī, Śivādūtī, may be regarded as different emanations of the Vedic Rātri.

THE UNIVERSALITY AND SUPREMACY OF BHAKTI-YOGA

By
SUBHASH ANAND

[भागवतपुराणे भक्तिर्बहुधा प्रपञ्चितेति दृश्यते । निबन्धेऽस्मिन् भक्ति-विषयको छौ प्रश्नौ विचारितौ—(१) किं भक्तिः सर्वेभ्योऽविशेषेण विहिता ? (अर्थात् वर्णादिभेदेन भक्त्यनुशीलनं भिद्यते न वेति); (२) परमपुरुषार्थ-साधनेषु भक्तेः प्राधान्यं भागवते स्वीकृतं न वेति ।

निबन्धलेखकेनेदं सिद्धान्तितं यद् यद्यपि भागवते भक्तेः सर्वोपकारिताः श्रुतगता, तथापि पुराणमिदं वर्णाश्रममर्यादां न सर्वथा तिरस्करोति । सर्वेषु साधनेषु भक्तिः प्रधानभूतेति भागवतीयं मतम् । भक्तिरियं वासुदेवविष्णु-परेति । निबन्धलेखकेन स्वमतं भागवतवाक्यानाम्, भागवतोक्तकथानां चाश्रयेण सुष्ठु प्रतिपादितम् । निबन्धान्ते भक्तेर्महिमा प्राचीनता चापि प्रकटीकृता ।]

The *Bhāgavata-purāṇa*,¹ which claims to be an infallible help to the spiritual pilgrim,² propounds *bhakti* as the highest *dharma* of man.³ In this article we shall discuss two questions : (1) Does the *BhP* propose the *bhakti-yoga* to all men and women, whatever be their social status ? In other words, we shall see how the *bhakti-yoga* stands in relation to the *varṇa-āśrama-dharma*. (2) Does the *BhP* give any preference to the *bhakti-yoga vis-a-vis* the other traditionally accepted ways of attaining realization ? To put it differently, is the *bhakti-yoga* one among other *mārgas* equally accepted by the *BhP*, or does the *BhP* give to it some special significance ?

1 : Bhakti—the Universal Way to God

Certain Limitations of the Varṇa-āśrama-dharma

The traditional understanding of *dharma* was to a large extent intimately linked with the two concepts of *varṇa* and *āśrama*.⁴

1. Henceforth abbreviated as *BhP*.
2. Cf. S. Anand, 'The Bhāgavata-purāṇa : A Guide for the Sādhaka', *Purāṇa* XX. 1, pp. 71-86.
3. Cf. S. Anand, 'Bhakti—the Bhāgavata Way to God', *Purāṇa* XXII. 2, pp. 187-211.
4. Cf. P. V. Kane, *History of Dharmaśāstra* (Poona, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1968), vol. I, p. 3.

In its earliest form, the *varṇa*-structure of society may have been a purely socio-economic phenomenon. Gradually, however, it acquired a religious significance, and the Śūdra was the greatest loser. He was not allowed to study the Veda. The Veda could be studied only by one who had been duly initiated through the *upanayana-saṁskāra*. The Śūdra was debarred from all *saṁskāras*, except *vivāha*. He could not be present even when the Veda was being recited. Therefore, the only *āśrama* open to him was the *gṛhasthya*.⁵

The *āśrama*-approach to life in its final development divided life into four stages. The first two were mainly concerned with the things of this life. Manu teaches that only after a man has discharged his debt to the seers, to the fathers, and to the gods, should he think of *mokṣa*.⁶ Medhātithi, who "most probably flourished between 825 and 900 A. D.," commenting on *Manu-smṛti* 6.97, remarks that the Śūdra by serving the Brāhmins and by fulfilling his household duties, acquires the fruits of all the *āśramas*, except *mokṣa*.⁷ *Mokṣa* can be acquired only by the proper observance of the fourth *āśrama*, i. e., *saṁnyāsa*.⁸ Kane, while discussing the relation between the *puṇyārtha*-doctrine and the *āśrama*-system seems to agree with Medhātithi in his understanding of the traditional stand of the Dharmaśāstras.¹⁰

Bhakti : a call to all men and women

The *BhP* clearly states that birth alone cannot be the source of man's greatness. That one is born in a high caste is no guarantee that one is dear to the Lord.¹¹ He is not pleased with anything that falls short of selfless *bhakti*.¹² Consequently, without *bhakti*, a

5. Cf. Kane, *Op. cit.* (1974), vol. II, pt. 1, pp. 154-64.

6. *adhītya vidhivad vedān putrāṁścotpādya dharmataḥ, iṣṭvā ca śaktitaḥ yajñair mano mokṣe niveśayet.* 6.36.

7. Kane : *Op. cit.*, I, p. 583.

8. *śūśrūṣayā' patyotpādanena ca sarvāśramaphalam labhate ---parivrājaphalam varjayitvā.*

9. Cf. Kane, *Op. cit.*, II-1, p. 163.

10. Cfr. *Ibid.*, pp. 422-4.

11. *nālaṁ dvijatvaṁ devatvaṁ ṛṣitvaṁ vāsuraṭmajāḥ, prīṇanāya mukundasya na vṛttaṁ na bahujñatā.* 7.7.51.

12. *prīyate' malayā bhaktyā hariranyad viḍambanam.* 7.7.52b.

noble birth, even in the family of a *ṛṣi*, is of no avail.¹³ Just as a high birth confers no privileges, so too, a low birth does not disqualify the Śūdra. The *BhP* has something very consoling to say of the origin of the Śūdra :

Service, which is needed to attain *dharma*, was born from the feet of the Lord. In the days of old the Śūdra was born for this service. By fulfilling this he pleases the Lord.¹⁴

Thus, far from being disadvantaged by his birth, the Śūdra seems to be in a better position, because his calling to service is helpful and necessary towards the fulfilment of the Law. Kṛṣṇa, too, has a very favourable attitude towards the Śūdra. He directs Nanda to give the outcastes a share of the sacrifice.¹⁵

Contrary to the stand taken by the authors of the Dharmaśāstras, the *BhP* teaches that all men and women can attain perfection,¹⁶ because all men can love the Lord, even the so-called "dog-eaters."¹⁷ To be a saint one need not be born in the family of a *dvija*. Like Satyakāma Jābala of old,¹⁸ Nārada was the son of a maid-servant,¹⁹ born to her as a result of being cursed to be born a Śūdra,²⁰ and he probably did not know who his father was. Yet, he was a great saint,²¹ honoured by all the gods.²² Vidura,

13. *ṛṣayo'pi deva yuṣmatprasāṅgavimukhā iha saṁsaranti.* 3.9.10b.

14. *padbhyāṁ bhagavato jajñe śuśrūṣā dharmasiddhaye, tasyāṁ jātaḥ purā śūdro yadvṛttyā tuṣyate hariḥ.* 3.6.33. All quotations from the *BhP* are my own translation.

15. See 10.24.28.

16. *daiteyā yakṣarakṣāṁsi striyaḥ śūdrāḥ vrajaukasaḥ, khagā mṛgāḥ pāpajīvāḥ santi hyacyutatām gatāḥ.* 7.7.54.

17. *bhaktyāham ekayā grāhyaḥ śraddhayā'tmā priyaḥ satām, bhaktiḥ punāti manniṣṭhā śvapākān api sambhavāt.* 11.14.21.

śvapāka is considered to be "a man of a very low and degraded caste." V. S. Apte, *The Students' Sanskrit-English Dictionary* (Delhi, Motilal Banarsidass, 1970), p. 567.

18. *Chāndogya-upaniṣad* 4.4.

19. See 1.5.23.

20. See 7.15.72.

21. *mahā-bhāgavata*, 2.9.41b.

22. *sura-pūjita*, 1.4.31b.

too, was a Śūdra.²³ Yet, Yudhiṣṭhira addressing him says :

O Lord, devotees of the Lord like you are made holy by the Lord who dwells in your heart. You in turn sanctify all the holy places.²⁴

To be a saint one need not receive *upanayana*, the *saṁskāra* by which a Hindu becomes a *dvija*. Śuka did not receive it,²⁵ yet, he was a great devotee of the Lord,²⁶ fully dedicated to Him.²⁷ To scale the heights of holiness one need not study the Veda. Sūta had not studied the Veda,²⁸ but he was no poorer for that, being accounted a great devotee of the Lord.²⁹

If God-realization is the goal of all men, and of women, irrespective of their caste, then it follows that the means thereto should be equally available to all. According to the Dharmaśāstras, one could begin the *brahmacarya-āśrama*—the student life—only after receiving the *upanayana*. Therefore only men of the first three castes could enter on spiritual discipleship. Women and Śūdras were debarred. But Kṛṣṇa opens the doors of spiritual discipleship to all, even to the Śūdras and to women. Winding up his teaching to Uddhava, he tells him :

You may impart the teaching I have given to you only to a man who is free from the faults I have indicated above, provided he is devoted to the Brāhmins, is loved by you, and is pure and pious. You may also impart this teaching to women and Śūdras provided they have devotion. Once a person has

23. He was actually Yama, born as a Śūdra, also due to a curse. See 3.5.20.

24. bhavadvidhā bhāgavatās tīrthabhūtāḥ svayaṁ vibho,
tīrthīkurvanti tīrthāni svāntaḥsthena gadābhṛtā. 1.13.10.

25. an-upeta, 1.2.2a.

26. bhāgavata-pradhāna, 2.3.25a.

27. vāsudeva-parāyaṇa, 2.3.16a.

28. ...snātamanyatra chandasāt. 1.4.13b.

When the sages justify themselves for choosing Sūta to narrate to them the story of Kṛṣṇa, they underline his wide learning. But the texts he has mastered are only *smṛti*-texts. See 1.1.6.

29. bhāgavat-pradhāna. 1.18.15a.

really understood this teaching nothing else remains to be known.³⁰

Thus the Śūdras and women are eligible to receive the fulness of spiritual discipleship.³¹ The Veda was a closed book for the Śūdra. It could not even be recited in his presence. The *BhP*, which claims to be the very essence of the Vedas,³² offers itself to all who care to study it with reverence.³³ The *BhP* lays the greatest stress on *satsaṅga* as a means to holiness.³⁴ The saint is open to all men, ready to accept anyone.³⁵ Thence *satsaṅga* is a universal sacrament. All types of men and women reach the heights of holiness through *satsaṅga*.³⁶ *Satsaṅga* nullifies all social disqualifications.³⁷ *Bhakti* makes up for the lack of all the other means, which are available to the privileged ones alone.³⁸ Indeed, an

-
30. etair doṣair vihināya brahmanyāya priyāya ca,
sādhave śucaye brūyād bhaktiḥ syācchūdrayoṣitām.
naitad vijñāya jijñāsor jñātavyamavaśiṣyate. 11.29.31-32a.
 31. For a complete discussion on the concept of spiritual discipleship as expounded by the *BhP*, cf. S. Anand: "Spiritual Discipleship as Described by the Bhāgavatapurāṇa," *Indian Theological Studies*, XV-1, pp. 21-55.
 32. akhila-śruti-sāra, 1.2.3a.
sarva-veda-anta-sāra, 12.13.12a.
 33. vipro' dhītyāpnuyāt prajñāṁ rājanyodadhimekhalām,
vaiśyo nidhipatitvaṁ ca śūdraḥ suddhyeta pātakāt.
12.12.64.
 34. Kṛṣṇa calls *satsaṅga* the greatest secret (*parama-guhya*). See 11.11.49a. For a complete discussion on the concept of *satsaṅga* as taught by the *BhP*, cf. S. Anand: "Satsaṅga: The Company of Saints", in G. M. Vaddakkekara (ed.): *Prayer and Contemplation* (Bangalore, Asirvanam, 1980), pp. 273-310.
 35. sarva-bhūta-sama, 11.2.52b.
 36. See 11.12.2-9.
 37. dauṣkulyamādhim vidhunoti śīgrāṁ mahattamānām abhidānayoḡaḥ. 1.18.18b.
 38. Devahūti addresses her son, Kapila, considered to be an *avatāra*: tepus tapaste juhuvuḥ sasnu rāryā brahmānūcurnāma grṇanti ye te. 3.33.7b.

Similarly, some Brāhmins who at first refused to honour the request made by Kṛṣṇa, eulogize their wives favoured by him :

outcaste, provided he is a *bhakta*, is superior to a Brahmin, who may be adorned with many qualities but bereft of *bhakti*.³⁹

The universalistic stand of the *BhP* is founded on the belief that Hari, being the soul of all,⁴⁰ looks upon all without partiality.⁴¹ He has no favourites, nor is He against anyone.⁴² But this does not mean that He is indifferent towards His devotees, far from it. The *bhakta* is most dear to Him. Kṛṣṇa tells Uddhava that he is dearer to Him than Śiva, Brahmā, and even Śrī.⁴³

Though the *BhP* has a universalistic attitude, it does not totally reject the traditional respect shown to the Brāhmin. Rṣabha, considered to be an *avatāra* of Hari, instructs his people thus :

I find no being equal to, much less higher than, the Brāhmin
I gladly accept the offering made through the Brāhmin,
provided it is accompanied with faith. Such an offering
surpasses the *agnihotra*.⁴⁴

To give gifts to the Brāhmins seems to be better than to offer a sacrifice ! Kṛṣṇa himself teaches the greatness of the Brāhmin, but he insists that this greatness is more the consequence of moral greatness than of birth alone :

nāsām dvijātisaṃskāro na nivāso gurāvapi,
na tapo nātmanimāṃsā na śaucam na kriyāḥ śubhāḥ.
athāpi hyuttamaśloke kṛṣṇe yogeśvareśvare,
bhaktirḍḍhā na cāsmakam saṃskārādīmatāmapi.
10.23.42-3.

39. viprād dviṣaḍguṇayutād aravindanābha-
pādāravindavimukhācchvapacam variṣṭham,
manyate tadarpitamanovacanahitartha.
prāṇam punāti sa kulam na tu bhūrimānaḥ. 7.9.10.
40. sarva-ātmā, 1.9.21a.
41. sama-dṛṣṭi, *ibid*.
42. na yasya, kaściddayito' sti karhicid
dveṣyaśca yasmin viṣamā matirṇṇām. 1.8.29b.
43. na tathā me priyatama ātmanyonir na śaṃkaraḥ,
na ca saṃkarṣaṇo na śrīrnaivātmā ca yathā bhavān.
11.14.15.
44. na brāhmaṇais tulaye bhūtamanyat
paśyāmi viprāḥ kimataḥ parām tu,
yasmin nṛbhiḥ prahutaḥ śraddhayāham
śānāmi kāmam na tathāgnihotre. 5.5.23.

By his very birth, the Brāhmin is superior to all beings, more so if he is endowed with penance, learning, contentment, and devotion to me.⁴⁵

The real Brāhmin is characterized by a spirit of forgiveness;⁴⁶ he is calm, considerate to the poor and needy, and looks upon all with an impartial eye.⁴⁷ Since it is moral greatness that constitutes the real Brāhmin, anyone who leads a life of virtue and *bhakti* can become a Brāhmin.⁴⁸ Here the *BhP* seems to give in to the factual religious dominance of the Brāhmins, but not quite, because by introducing the moral and religious consideration in the concept of Brāhminhood, it implicitly passes a judgement on the practice then prevalent.

Bhakti and temporal involvement

The *saṁnyāsa-āśrama* which was particularly suited for the quest of *mokṣa*—according to the opinion commonly held by the Dharmaśāstra writers—demands that a man renounces everything, even his house, so that he is obliged to go from place to place, to be a *parivrāt*. In the first two *āśramas* man fulfilled the first three *puṇyārthas* : *dharma*, *artha*, *kāma*. Only in the third did he think of *mokṣa*.

The *BhP*, however, teaches that supreme *bhakti* is possible while being involved in things mundane. Temporal commitment is not incompatible with holiness for one who is detached. King Dhruva, while he continues to rule his kingdom, while he continues his quest for *artha*, *kāma*, and *dharma*,⁴⁹ has his senses fully under control,⁵⁰ his mind immovably fixed on the Lord.⁵¹ Similarly,

-
45. brāhmaṇo janmanā śreyān sarveṣāṁ prāṇināmiha, tapasā vidyayā tuṣṭyā kimu matkalayā yutaḥ. 10.86.53.
 46. Jamadagni to his son, Paraśurāma, after the latter slew King Arjuna : vyaṁ hi brāhmaṇās tāta kṣamayārha-ṇatām gatāḥ. 9.15.39a.
 47. brāhmaṇaḥ samadṛk śānto dīnānāṁ samupekṣakaḥ. 4.14.41a.
 48. Speaking of the sons of Rṣabha, the *BhP* remarks : karmavisuddhā brāhmaṇā babhūvuḥ.
 49. trivarga-aupayika, 4.12.14b.
 50. avicala-indriya, 4.12.14a.
 51. acalita-smṛti, 4.12.8b.

we have the instance of king Pṛthu, foremost among the great.⁵² He has fully attained the heights of perfection, his mind being completely fixed on the Lord.⁵³ Yet he continues to exercise his royal power, fulfilling all his duties, that too in a thorough manner.⁵⁴ This is possible only when one has his feet firmly on this earth. The story of Sudāmā is one of the most moving episodes in the *BhP*. In him we see the possibility of great sanctity within the *gārhasthya-āśrama*. He is fully detached from sensual objects, calm, and self-possessed.⁵⁵ Hence, though fulfilling the duties incumbent upon him as a householder, he does not get attached to things of this world.⁵⁶

Once again the *BhP* finds the justification for this stand in the mystery of God Himself. He creates and sustains everything; He leads all creation to its goal: yet, He Himself remains unattached, fully free.⁵⁷ This is true also with regard to His *avatāra*, Lord Kṛṣṇa, who moves about in the world, fully detached, seeking nothing but the good of the world.⁵⁸ This is possible because God has in Himself all fullness; He does not need to seek it outside Himself. So, too, the *bhakta* has in his heart the Lord Himself. What else does he need to look for?⁵⁹ As God is one who has His purpose always fulfilled, so, too, the *bhakta* is happy with what he has.⁶⁰ If he gets involved in the world, it is not out of personal interest, but because the Lord wants him to do so.⁶¹ Only in this context

52.dhuryo mahatām.... 4.33.49a.

53.ātmanyavasthitāḥ. 4.22.49b.

54. karmāṇi ca yathākālāṁ yathādeśaṁ yathābalam,
yathocitaṁ yathāvittam akarod brahmasātkṛtam. 4.22.50.

55. virakta indriyārtheṣu praśāntātmā jitendriyaḥ. 10.80.6b.

56. Kṛṣṇa, praising his friend, Sudāmā, tells him :
prāyo gr̥heṣu te cittamakāma vihataṁ tathā,
naivātipriyase vidvan dhaneṣu viditaṁ hi me. 10.80.29.

57. sa vā idaṁ viśvamamoghalīlaḥ sṛjatyavatyatti na
sajjate' smin. 1.3.10a.

58. Kṛṣṇa tells Sudāmā :
kecit kurvanti karmāṇi kāmairahatacetasāḥ,
tyajantaḥ prakṛtiṁ daivīṁ yathāhaṁ lokasaṁgraham.
10.80.30.

59. ihate bhagavānīso no hi tatra viśajjate,
ātmalābhena pūrṇārtho nāvasidanti ye' nu tam. 8.1.15.

60. nija-lābha-tuṣṭa, 1.19.25b.

61.īśvareccayādhiniveśitakarmādhikāraḥ.... 5.1.23.

does temporal involvement become part of the service rendered to the Lord.⁶² However, the *BhP* is also aware that this combination of temporal involvement and the quest for perfection is difficult. Like Brahmā, man has to pray that while being involved in the world his heart may be fixed on the Lord.⁶³ The Lord by His grace will definitely sustain His sincere devotee.⁶⁴ Thus, *bhakti*, by purifying man, makes his secular involvement selfless, and thereby more authentic.

Conclusion : Bhakti as sādharma dharma

The *BhP* does not reject outright the *varṇa-dharma*. It gives a special place of honour to the Brāhmin, but it also re-defines Brāhminhood in accordance with its central teaching. The real Brāhmin is the *bhakta*, and all men, and even women, can be *bhaktas*. Similarly, the *BhP* does not reject the division of human life into four states, but asserts that *bhakti*, the *dharma* of the *paramahansa*,⁶⁵ is beyond all *āśramas*,⁶⁶ and therefore attainable in every state of life. *Bhakti*, then, is the *sādharma-dharma*, the universal *dharma*. It cuts across all strata of society and all stages of life. *Bhakti* gives meaning to all other *dharma*s and fulfils it, as Sūta tells the sages of Naimiṣāraṇya :

O best among the twice-born, to please the Lord is the perfection of *dharma*, properly fulfilled by men, according to their *varṇa* and *āśrama*.⁶⁷

62. Brahmā, tells Svāyambhuva-Manu :

param śuśrūṣaṇam mahyam syāt prajāraṅkṣayā nṛpa,
bhagavānste prajābhartur hṛṣikeśo' nutuṣyati. 3.13.12.

63. Brahmā, when commissioned by Viṣṇu to create the world prays that while doing so, he may remain free from all attachment: his mind fully fixed on the Lord. See 2.9.28-9.

64. Brahmā, whose prayer is heard, is given this assurance by Viṣṇu : nānākarmavitānena prajā bahvīḥ sisṛkṣataḥ,
nātmāvasādatyasminste varṣiyan madanugrahaḥ.

65. Cf. Anand : "The Bhāgavata-purāṇa : A Guide for the Sādharma." 79-82.

66. sarva-āśrama-namaskṛta, 1.3.13b.

67. ataḥ pumbhir dvijaśreṣṭha varṇāśramavibhāgaśaḥ,
svanuṣṭhitasya dharmasya sarvasiddhir haritoṣaṇam. 1.2.13.

Hence, a man may fail to observe his *sva-dharma*, and yet suffer no loss, provided he has *bhakti*; on the other hand, a man who observes *svadharma* but has no *bhakti* has everything to lose.⁶⁸

II : Bhakti—the best way to God

Uddhava's question

In his instruction to his devoted pupil, Uddhava, Kṛṣṇa tells him that in order to help man attain his ultimate goal, he, Kṛṣṇa, has propounded three *yogas*, namely, *karma-*, *jñāna-*, and *bhakti-yoga*. Besides these there is no other way man can reach his goal.⁶⁹ The *BhP* is thus well aware of the three traditional ways to self-realization. The question that troubles Uddhava is whether man is free to choose any of these or if one of them is superior to the other two.⁷⁰ We shall now try to see what the *BhP* has to say on this matter.

Bhakti and the Karma-mārga

The *Mīmāṃsā-sūtras* of Jaimini define *dharma* as “a desirable goal or result that is indicated by injunctive passages.”⁷¹ Kane believes that here *dharma* means “such rites as are conducive to happiness and are enjoined by Vedic passages.”⁷² In interpreting *dharma* in terms of religious rites, Kane takes his cue from Śabaras-vāmi, who in his commentary on the *Mīmāṃsā-sūtras*, explains that the object of the injunction is (religious) action.⁷³ The *Mīmāṃsā* school of thought divides religious rites into three kinds. The *nitya-karmas* are those rituals that man was obliged to perform every day.

68. tyaktvā svadharmaṁ caraṇāmbujaṁ harer
bhajannapakvo' tha patet tato yadi,
yatra kva vābhadramabhūdamuṣya kiṁ
ko vārtha āpto' bhajatām svadharmataḥ. 1.5.17.
69. yogāstrayo mayā proktā nṛṇāṁ śreyovidhitsayā,
jñānaṁ karma ca bhaktiśca nopāyo'nyo'sti kutra cit.
11.20.6.
70. vadanti kṛṣṇa śreyāṁsi bahūni brahmavādināḥ,
teṣāṁ vikalpaprādhānyam utāho ekamukhyatā. 11.14.1.
71. codanālakṣaṇārtho dharmah. 1.1.2.
Quoted by Kane, *op. cit.*, I, p. 5.
72. *Ibid.*
73. codaneti kriyāyāḥ pravartakam vacanamāhuḥ.
Quoted by R. S. Misra : *Studies in Philosophy and Religion*
(Varanasi, Bharatiya Vidya Prakāśan, 1971), p. 119.

The *naimittika-karmas* are those rituals that had to be performed when some definite occasion arose. The *kāmya-karmas* were left to the choice of the individual. He performed them when he wanted to achieve some definite purpose.⁷⁴

The *BhP* opens with a sacrificial scene. It makes a subtle derogatory remark about the sacrificial system. The sages who asked Sūta to narrate to them the story of Kṛṣṇa tell him :

We are engaged in this sacrificial action, even though we are not sure of its outcome. The smoke rising from the fire is soiling us. But you quench our thirst by offering us the sweet honey flowing from the lotus feet of the Lord.⁷⁵

Not only is the sacrificial system devoid of assurance, but it leaves the participants soiled by the smoke ! A stronger rejection of the sacrificial system is voiced by Yama in his instruction to his servants after they return empty-handed on being repelled by the messengers of Viṣṇu from dragging away Ajāmila⁷⁶ :

The Vedas attract man by their sweet and flowery speech. Man's understanding gets clouded on hearing them, and then without much discernment he engages in ritual action, not realizing the greatness of the divine name, as his mind is confused by the divine *māyā*.⁷⁷

Here the involvement in the sacrificial action is attributed to the delusion brought about by *māyā*. A man who concentrates on the sacrificial structure, convinced of its omnipotence, does not

74. Cfr. Misra : *op. cit.*, pp. 119-20.

75. *karmaṇyasmin nanāśvāse dhūmadhūmrātmanām bhavān, āpāyayati govindapādapadmāsavaṁ madhu. 1.18.12.*

Elaborate sacrificial performance required the assistance of a *purohita*. The *BhP* does not seem to have much respect for this office either. Being deserted by Bṛhaspati, the gods request Viśvarūpa to be their priest. The latter is reluctant, because the priesthood is condemned by virtuous men, and only a fool is happy with it. See 6.7.35-6.

76. For the details of the story of Ajāmila, see 6.1-3.

77. *prāyeṇa veda tadidaṁ na mahājano'yaṁ devyā vimohitamatiṁ bata māyayālam, trayyām jaḍikṛtamatiṁ madhupuṣpitāyām vaitānike mahati karmāṇi yujyamānaḥ. 6.3.25.*

realize the glory of the *bhakti-mārga*.⁷⁸ The reward of sacrificial action is perishable⁷⁹, and concerns the first three *puruṣārthas* only⁸⁰ and as such, it is the source of rebirth.⁸¹

The *BhP* is well aware of the traditional belief in the doctrine of sacrifice. In a lengthy passage it gives the various benefits to be obtained by sacrificing to the different Vedic deities, and concludes thus :

A man with a great understanding, whether he is free from all desire, or wishes to possess all, or longs for *mokṣa* alone, should worship with intense devotion the supreme *Puruṣa*. For the realization of the supreme goal for all worshippers is had when they experience a steadfast devotion to the Lord. This is possible only through the company of the saints.⁸²

The *BhP*, thus, in very clear terms states that by *bhakti* alone can man attain all the benefits of the different *yajñas*; that *bhakti* is the supreme *yajña*; that *bhakti* is the real goal of all *yajñas*.

This attitude of the *BhP* is well illustrated in the episode of Bali.⁸³ He was a Daitya. By faithfully serving his preceptors he had attained great gifts. He conquered the whole world, and even ousted Indra from his kingdom. Aditi, the mother of the gods, seeing the sad plight of her son, advised by her husband, worships Viṣṇu, to obtain a son who would be a match for Bali. In the meanwhile, the humiliated Indra is told that only Viṣṇu can come to his rescue. He betakes himself to Viṣṇu. In answer to his prayer, Viṣṇu condescends to be born of Aditi. This is his *Vāmana-avatāra*. Then dressed as a Brāhmin lad, he goes to the sacrificial

78. From the total context of the story of Ajāmila, is obvious that Yama is contrasting the *bhakti-mārga* with the *karma-mārga*.

79. kṣayīṣṇu, 7.7.40a.

80. traivargika-karma, 2.4.4a.

81. evaṁ nṛṇāṁ kriyāyogāḥ sarve saṁsṛtihetavaḥ
ta evātmavināśāya kālpante kalpitāḥ pare. 1 5.34.

82. akāmaḥ sarvakāmo vā mokṣakāma udāradhīḥ,
tīvreṇa bhaktiyogena yajeta puruṣaṁ param.
etāvāneva yajatām iha nīśreyasodayaḥ,
bhagavatyacalo bhāvo yad bhāgavatasāṅgataḥ. 2 3.10-11.

83. The story of Bali is found in 8.15-23.

hall of Bali and asks for some gift. Śukra, Bali's preceptor, sensing the danger, advises him against granting the wish of Vāmana. But Bali, not wishing to break his promise, insists on giving to Vāmana whatever he may ask. Vāmana asks for three paces of land. Bali, seeing no difficulty, grants the request. Vāmana covers the whole earth in one stride, with the second he measures the heavens. Since nothing more is left for the third step, Bali is bound and taken to hell. Then Vāmana tells Śukra to complete the half-performed sacrifice. To this Śukra replies :

O Lord, you are the Lord of all action, the Lord of all sacrifices, nay, you are the very embodiment of sacrifice. Bali has worshipped you with all his being. How, then, can his sacrificial action remain incomplete? The recitation of your sacred name makes reparation for all sacrificial defects whether these defects be due to faulty *mantra* or ritual, or improper time or place.⁸⁴

Could the offering of such a generous soul like that of Bali remain incomplete? Thus it is only when *karma* is surrendered to the Lord that it becomes fruitful.⁸⁵ It is *bhakti* that makes this detachment possible.

Karma is an initial requirement. The real import of the Vedas is not to impose *karma*, but to free man from *Karma*.⁸⁶ Man reaches this stage only when he performs the action enjoined by the Vedas in a spirit of surrender.⁸⁷ Hence it is only when he has matured in *bhakti* that he can abandon the *karma-mārga*.⁸⁸ It is for this reason that Nārada, who is considered to be a great teacher of

84. kutas tatkarmavaiṣamyam yasya karmesvaro bhavān,
yajñeśo yajñapurusaḥ sarvabhāvena pūjitaḥ.
mantratas tantratas chidraṁ deśakālārhavastutaḥ,
sarvaṁ karoti niśchidraṁ nāmasaṁkirtanaṁ tava.
8.23.15-6.

85. See above, note 81.

86. paroḥṣavādo vedo' yaṁ bālānām anuśāsanam,
karmamokṣāya karmāṇi vidhatte hyagaḍam yathā. 11.3.44.

87. vedoktamevaṁ kurvāṇo nissāṅgo'rpitamīśvare,
naiṣkarmyāṁ labhate siddhim rocanārthā phalaśrutiḥ.
11.3.46.

88. tāvat karmāṇi kurvīta na nirvidyeta yāvataḥ,
matkathāśravaṇādau vā śraddhā yāvan na jāyate. 11.20.9.
15

the *bhakti-yoga*, is also the one who teaches *naiṣkarmya* (actionlessness).⁸⁹ We can easily understand this stand of the *BhP* if we bear in mind that the Lord is the heart of the sacrifice.⁹⁰

Action is but the indication of a deeper disposition. It is this inner disposition that gives meaning to our action. But when the inner attitude has reached a great depth then action becomes ineffective : it cannot convey the depth of the attitude. Then the best course of action is to cease from all action. So too, in spiritual life, *bhakti* is the highest fulfilment of man. It alone gives meaning to *karma*. Consequently, when through intense *bhakti*, a man is in deep communion with Him who is the Lord of *karma* and *yajña*,⁹¹ then all action becomes superfluous.

Then silence, not merely of words, but of the total human endeavour, is the best expression of that inner depth. Then this silence speaks more loudly than words and actions, because the Lord is beyond all human expression, and our silence is the most profound proclamation of his ineffability, of his transcendence. It is this that lies behind the instruction of Kṛṣṇa to Uddhava :

○ Uddhava, put aside your concern for what the law lays down or prohibits, nor be too worried about what you do or do not do, about what you have learnt in the sacred books and what you have still to learn. Come to me, for I am the one refuge of all beings. By surrendering yourself totally to me you will have no reason to be afraid.⁹²

But silence and actionlessness are difficult for man as they hurt his pride, reminding him of his own inherent poverty. Hence only the grace of the Lord can help man to accept this attitude, as Nārada tells King Prācīnabarhiṣ :

89. tṛtīyam ṛsisargaṁ ca devarṣitvam upetya saḥ,
tantraṁ sāvataṁ ācaṣṭa naiṣkarmyaṁ karmaṇāṁ yataḥ.
1.3.8.

90. yajña-hṛdaya, 4.9.24a.

91. Viṣṇu is also called *yajña-līṅga*, (3.13.13a), *yajña-puruṣa* (3.13.23b), *yajña-bhāvana* (3.13.34a), and *yajña-mūrti* (3.14.2a).

92. tasmāt tvam uddhavotsṛjya codanāṁ praticodanāṁ,
pravṛttāṁ ca nivṛttāṁ ca śrotavyāṁ śrutameva ca.
mām ekameva śaraṇaṁ ātmānaṁ sarvadehinām,
yāhi sarvātmabhāvena mayā syā hyakutobhayaḥ.

When a man, who contemplates the Lord with his whole self, receives His grace, then he puts aside his attachment for this world as well as his faith in the Veda.⁹³

Man can fully put aside himself and all his efforts only when sustained by the grace of God he realizes that God can do much more for him than he can even think of. Only in this attitude of loving trust will man be prepared to face his own poverty, his own helplessness to help himself.

Bhakti and the Jñāna-mārga

The Ṛgvedic seers approached the *devas* with gifts, hoping to be blessed in return. As the sacrificial system developed, it acquired more importance than the *devas* themselves. Not only man, but even the *devas* were in need of the sacrifice. If they won a fight against the *asuras*, it was because they knew the art of sacrifice. Even Prajāpati, after he is exhausted by his creative activity, needs to be revived by a sacrifice. Thus the sacrifice became an "omnipotent world-principles."⁹⁴ If the sacrifice was so important, then the man who knew the mystery of the sacrifice, the man who knew the connection of the sacrifice with the world, was considered to be great.⁹⁵ Just as the sacrifice had supplanted the *devas*, so too, in the course of time, the knowledge of the world-principle embodied in the sacrifice became more important than the sacrifice itself, and eventually the sacrifice was ignored. This attitude finds its most zealous advocates in the Upaniṣads.

The Upaniṣads repeat the refrain found in the Brāhmaṇas : "He who knows....." Knowledge is of two types : *para* and *apara*. It is the former that leads to *mokṣa*. Celibacy, penance, *yoga* and

93. yadā yam anugṛhṇāti bhagavān ātmabhāvitāḥ,
sa jahāti matim loke vede ca pariniṣṭhitām. 4.29.46

94. S. K. Belvalkar and R. D. Ranade : *History of Indian Philosophy* (Poona, Bilvakunja Publishing House, 1927), vol. II, pp. 65-6.

95. In the Brāhmaṇas we often find references to the man who knows :

.... yaśo ha bhavati ya evaṁ vidvān. *Śatapatha-brāhmaṇa*
1.1.1.5.

.... sa yasya haivaṁ viduṣaḥ *Ibid.* 1.1.4.17.

... evametad veda, *Ibid.* 1.2.5.7.

.... yasyaivaṁ viduṣaḥ.... *Ibid.* 1.4.1.35, etc.

study are directed towards the acquisition of this *para-vidyā*. The disciple has to be instructed by a worthy teacher, but he must also personally assimilate the teaching by constant meditation.⁹⁶

In his instruction to Uddhava, Kṛṣṇa tells him :

Only those who have been perfected through knowledge and discernment know my highest state. Therefore the *jñānin* is very dear to me. By his knowledge he sustains me. Penance, pilgrimage, recitation of prayer, alms, or the other means of sanctification cannot help man to attain that perfection which even a small fraction of knowledge can.⁹⁷

From these lines one may get the impression that the *BhP* affirms the supremacy of the *jñāna-mārga*. But even a casual reading of the whole chapter from which these lines have been taken will make it quite clear that the *jñāna* spoken of here is penetrated through and through with *bhakti*. The lines that immediately follow this passage make it quite clear :

Therefore, O Uddhava, having come to know (me as) your Self through knowledge, and being equipped with knowledge and discernment, *being full of devotion*, worship me.⁹⁸

The stand of the *BhP* with regard to the *jñāna-mārga* is similar to that with regard to *karma-mārga*, i. e., *jñāna* is meaningful only in relation to *bhakti*. This explains why Vyāsa, who has studied everything, feels like one who has not yet attained his goal.⁹⁹ This is because knowledge, however great, is by itself futile.¹⁰⁰

96. Cf. S. Anand : "The Upaniṣadic Theology of Salvation", *Paths-Mārga*, III-2, pp. 12-5.

97. *jñānavijñānasamsiddhāḥ padaṁ śreṣṭhaṁ vidurmama, jñāni priyatamo' to me jñānenāsau bibharti mām. tapas tirthaṁ japo dānaṁ pavitrāṇitarāṇi ca, nālaṁ kurvanti tāṁ siddhiṁ yā jñānakalayā kṛtā. 11.19.3-4*

98. *tasmā jñānena sahitaṁ jñātvā svātmānam uddhava, jñānavijñānasampanno bhaja mām bhaktibhāvitaḥ. 11.19.5.*

Emphasis mine.

99. Finding Vyāsa sad at heart, Nārada expresses his surprise to him :

jijñāsitam adhitaṁ ca yat tad brahma sanātanam, athāpi śocasyātmānam akṛtārtha iva prabho. 1.5.4.

100. *naishkarmyam apyacyutabhāvavarjitam na śobhate jñānamalaṁ nirañjanam. 1.5.12.*

Jñāna is a preparation for *bhakti*. It is by *jñāna* that man realizes that Hari is the Lord of all, the most worthy of love. It is by *jñāna* that man sees the futility of everything else.¹⁰¹ On the other hand, the *BhP* also teaches that it is by *bhakti* alone that man can reach the knowledge of the highest reality :

Just as an ignorant man does not understand the behaviour of an actor doing wonderful things with his mind and words, so too a man of poor intelligence cannot by all his skill understand the name, manifestation or doings of the Lord. Only that man who with constant and sincere devotion reverences the scent coming from the Lotus-feet of the Lord can understand His ways, of that Lord who holds the discus and of whose power there is no end.¹⁰²

No human effort can reveal the mystery of God, The Lord Himself imparts this knowledge which is a great secret. Viṣṇu tells Brahmā :

Under my instruction receive the most secret knowledge together with discernment and whatever is helpful for it. By my grace you will truly come to know me as I am, my true nature, my form, quality and action.¹⁰³

To know the Lord man has to come to Him in *bhakti*, and the Lord by His *anugraha* reveals Himself to his *bhakta*.¹⁰⁴ The *bhakta* expresses his love by serving the devotees of the Lord and thus

101. The Pracetasas request Nārada to instruct them in that wisdom which will reveal reality to them and help them to cross the ocean of death and rebirth. Nārada in his instruction tells them of the futility of everything else other than Hari. See 4.31.7-25. Note the *bhakti*-tone.

102. na cāsya kaścinnipuṇena dhātur
avaiti jantuḥ kumaṇiṣa ūtiḥ,
nāmāni rūpāṇi manovacobhiḥ
santanvato nāṭacaryamivājñāḥ.
sa veda dhātuḥ padaviṁ parasya
durantavīryasya rathāṅgapāṇeḥ,
yo'māyayā santatayānuvṛtṭyā
bhajete tatpādasarojagandham. 1.3.37-8.

103. jñānam paramaguhyam me yad vijñānasamanvitam,
sarahasyam tadāṅgam ca grhāṇa gaditam mayā.
yāvān aham yathābhāvo yadrūpaṅgaṇakarmakaḥ,
tathaiva tattvavijñānam astu te madanugrahāt. 2.9.30-1.

104. madbhaktaḥ pratibuddhārtho matprasādēna bhūyasā.
3.27.28a.

becomes worthy of God's revelation.¹⁰⁵ By love and God's grace man gets an intuitive grasp of the highest reality.¹⁰⁶

The reason for this stand of the *BhP* is not difficult to see. If the knowledge that brings perfection is about the highest reality, then it has to be penetrated by *bhakti*. According to the *BhP*, Kṛṣṇa himself is the supreme reality.¹⁰⁷ He reveals himself as a great lover. It is he who calls the *gopīs* to himself, but they cannot, even when allowed intimacy with him, claim him to be their own in such a way as to possess him. He remains forever the Lord, free to reveal or veil himself. If he reveals himself, it is only within the context of love. It is only when through love he has entered the heart of man that he unveils his face.¹⁰⁸ The knowledge that brings holiness and eventually salvation is not the knowledge of a thing which man can arrogantly invade, but the knowledge of him who is fully free, and before whom man must stand in humility and reverence as before a mystery. It is the knowledge born of personal communion which is impossible without love and grace. If this knowledge leads to *ātma-darśana*, then it is not the stare of an indifferent, unconcerned onlooker, but the contemplation of a lover.¹⁰⁹

With reference to the teaching Kapila gave to his mother, Devahūti, S. Bhattacharya has this to say :

105. jñānam viśuddham paramārthamekam
anantaram tvabahir brahma satyam,
pratyak praśāntam bhagavacchabdasamjñam
yadvāsudevam kavayo vadanti.
rahūṇanaitat tapasā na yāti
na cejyayā nirvapaṇād grhād vā,
na cchandasā naiva jalāgnisūryair
viṇā mahatpādarajo' bhiṣekam. 5.12.11-2.
106. vāsudeve bhagavati bhaktiyogaḥ prayojitaḥ.
janayatyāśu vairāgyam jñānam ca yad ahaitukam. 1.2.7
107. Cf. S. Anand : "Saguṇa or Nirguṇa", *Purāṇa*, XXI-1,
pp. 40-63.
108. hr̥di sthito yacchati bhaktipūte
jñānam satattvādhigamam purāṇam. 3.5.4b.
109. tacchraddadhānā munayo jñānavairagyayuktayā,
paśyantyātmani cātmānam bhaktyā śrutagr̥hītayā. 1.2.12.
This *ātma-darśana* is the same as *hari-darśana*. See 1.6.16-7

While the Bhāgavata disowns the claim of the path of action as an independent method, it has the unique catholicity to consider the path of knowledge and the path of devotion on equal footing. This is what the great saint Kapila has to say on this issue : The Paths of knowledge and devotion are equally good, for any one of them can take the *puruṣa* to *Puruṣa*.¹¹⁰

The verse in particular which he has in mind reads thus :

O daughter of Manu, *bhakti* and *yoga* have both been explained by me. By following one of them a man may attain the Supreme *Puruṣa*.¹¹¹

It does not seem to me quite correct to evaluate a work mainly on the basis of one isolated verse, ignoring the overall trend. Further, we have shown that in the *BhP* *jñāna* is essentially linked with *bhakti*, and is the result of divine grace. Also, the fact that two ways are available to reach one and the same goal is no indication that both are equally good. If that were so, we might as well stop travelling by train and go back to our bullock-carts ! Again, the text referred to does not explicitly speak of the *jñāna-mārga*, but of *yoga*. We shall show that according to the explicit teaching of the *BhP*, *bhakti-mārga* is superior to *yoga*. Lastly, Bhattacharya is not quite consistent with his own stand. In the second volume of his study on the *BhP*, he has one chapter entitled 'The Sovereignty of the Path of Devotion',¹¹² where he says :

---The Bhāgavata seems to have dislodged both rituals and knowledge from their status of *dharma* and appropriated it instead in favour of devotion.¹¹³

Bhakti and Yoga

In the *BhP*, the word *yoga* is found in the plural.¹¹⁴ It is thus used both in the general as well as in the specialized sense. The *BhP* speaks of *bhaktiyoga*.¹¹⁵ Kṛṣṇa uses the word to mean the

110. *Op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 11.

111. *bhaktiyogaśca yogaśca mayā mānavyudīritaḥ, yayor ekatareṇaiva puruṣaḥ puruṣam vrajet.* 3.29.35.

112. Cf. pp. 107-30.

113. p. 109.

114. *drṣṭā yogāḥ prayuktāśca...* 4.18.13b.

115. See 3.29.35b.

three *mārgas*.¹¹⁶ On the other hand, the word is also used to indicate the *aṣṭa-aṅga-yoga*.¹¹⁷ We are now faced with the question : Can *aṣṭa-aṅga-yoga* as taught by its earliest proponents afford to ignore the *bhakti-mārga* as propounded by the *BhP*?¹¹⁸

The *Yoga-sūtra* speaks of *īśvara-praṇidhāna*.¹¹⁹ The *Vyāsa-bhāṣya* explains it as *bhakti*,¹²⁰ and as the offering of all action to *īśvara*, the supreme teacher.¹²¹ Dasgupta is of the opinion that these are two different ideas expressed by the same term. He writes :

This word (*īśvara-praṇidhāna*), according to the commentators, is used in two senses in the first and second books of the Patañjala Yoga aphorisms. In the first book it means love or devotion to God as the one centre of meditation, in the second it is used to mean the abnegation of all fruits of actions to *īśvara*, and thus *īśvara-praṇidhāna* in this sense is included under *kriyāyoga*.¹²²

116. *yogāstrayo mayā proktāḥ*.... 11.20.6a.

117. *yamādibhīryaḥ oṅapathaiḥ*.... 3.27.6a.

11.15 speaks of the various *siddhis* obtained by *yoga*.

118. The earliest systematic presentation of the *aṣṭa-aṅga-yoga* is found in the *Yoga-sūtra*, attributed to Patañjali and written between 300 A. D. and 500 A. D. It has a *bhāṣya* supposed to have been written by Vyāsa between 650 and 850 A. D. Cf. J. H. Woods : *The Yoga-System of Patañjali* (Delhi, Motilal Banarsidass, rep. 1972), pp. xvii-xxi. Dasgupta accepts the traditional view that the same Patañjali wrote the *Mahā-bhāṣya* on Pāṇini's *Sūtras*, as well as composed the *Yoga-sūtras*, Cf. S. N. Dasgupta : *A History of Indian Philosophy* (Cambridge University Press, 1952), vol. I, pp. 226-38.

119. *īśvarapraṇidhānād vā*. 1.23 See also 2.1, 32, 54.

120. *praṇidhānādbhaktiviśeṣād*. *Vyāsa-bhāṣya* on 1.23.

121. *īśvarapraṇidhānam sarvakriyāṇām paramagurūvarpaṇam tatphalasannyāso vā*. *Vyāsa-bhāṣya* on 2.1. This is repeated without any fundamental change in the comment on 2.32 and 2.45.

122. *Yoga as Philosophy and Religion* (Delhi, Motilal Banarsidass rep. 1973), p. 161.

However, Bhoja, who flourished in the eleventh century A. D.,¹²³ does not seem to accept this distinction.¹²⁴ Thus in the two earliest proponents of the *aṣṭa-āṅga-yoga* we do have the notion of *bhakti* as the surrender of action with its fruits to *Īśvara*, who is viewed as the supreme teacher.

The *Yoga-sūtra* defines *yoga* as "the restriction of the fluctuations of the mind-stuff."¹²⁵ The result of this restriction is that "then the seer (that is, the self), abides in himself."¹²⁶ The *BhP* is aware of this definition of *yoga*.¹²⁷ Kapila begins his discourse of the *aṣṭa-āṅga-yoga* with these words :

O Princess, I shall explain to you the characteristics of *yoga* with some aid to concentration. By this process your mind, having become tranquil, will follow the right path.¹²⁸

After finishing his discourse on *yoga*, he tells his mother that he has explained the *bhakti-yoga* and the *aṣṭa-āṅga-yoga* and that by one of these two man can reach the supreme *Puruṣa*.¹²⁹ From this it may appear that according to the *BhP* both the aforesaid *yogas* are equally good. We have already noted that this was the conclusion arrived at by Bhattacarya. But we have to examine the issue in the total context of the *BhP*.

The *BhP* clearly states that the goal of *yoga* is not merely the cessation of mental unrest, but to make man pleasing to *Viṣṇu*,¹³⁰ so that he can concentrate and experience the communion that is

123. Cf. V. Karnatak : *Vyākhyākāron kī Dṛṣṭi se Pātāñjal-Yogasūtra kā Samīkṣātmak Adhyayan* (Benaras, Hindu University, 1974), *Bhūmikā*, p. 27.

124. Bhoja explains *īśvara-praṇidhāna* as *sarva-kriyā-arpaṇa* already in his comment on 1.23, while Vyāsa does it only in his comment on 2.1. This explains Dasgupta's opinion.

125. *yogaścittavṛttinirodhaḥ*. 1.2. (tr. Woods)

126. *tadā draṣṭuḥ svarūpe' vasthānam*. 1.3. (tr. Woods)

127. E. g. : *eṣa vai paramo yogo manasaḥ saṁgrahaḥ smṛtaḥ*. 1.1.20.21a. *paro hi yogo manasaḥ samādhiḥ*. 1.1.23.46b.

128. *yogasya lakṣaṇaṁ vakṣye sabījasya nṛpātmaṇe, mano yenaiva vidhinā prasannaṁ yāti satpatham*. 3.28.1.

129. See note 111.

130. *tā eva niyamāḥ sākṣāt tā eva ca yamottamāḥ, tapo dānaṁ vrataṁ yajño yena tuṣyatyadhokṣajaḥ*. 8.16.61.

characterised by love.¹³¹ It is precisely because *yoga* is subservient to *bhakti* that Nārada can direct Vyāsa to recollect the wonderful deeds of Viṣṇu with the help of *samādhi*.¹³² The mental calm aimed at by *yoga* is attained through the eight-fold process beginning with the *yamas*.¹³³ The *BhP* clearly teaches that the self will not attain peace so effectively by the *aṣṭa-aṅga-yoga* as by *bhakti*. Nārada, wanting to encourage the frustrated Vyāsa, shares with him his spiritual experience. He has learnt by experience that :

A heart overcome by passion and greed does not attain peace by the practice of *yama* and other limbs of *yoga* as effectively it does through the devotion to the Lord.¹³⁴

Thus, not only is mental calm a preparation for the fullness of *bhakti*, but this mental calm is not possible without *bhakti*.¹³⁵ It is for this reason that when Kṛṣṇa enumerates the *yamas* and *niyamas* he includes therein such elements as faith (*śraddhā*) and pilgrimage (*tīrtha*).¹³⁶

As we have already noted, the *Yoga-sūtra* does speak about devotion.¹³⁷ But M. Eliade believes Īśvara has a "comparatively small" role in the *yoga*-process and the *bhakti* spoken of in the *Yoga-sūtra* and the *Vyāsa-bhāṣya* is an "extremely rarefied, extremely intellectual devotion;" the *īśvara* of the *Yoga-sūtra* is a "macroyogin" deprived of all emotions. If he finds a place in the Sūtras, it is not because the Sūtrakāra was personally convinced that he should be there, but simply because he had to take note of the fact that

131. *bhakti-lakṣaṇa-yoga*, 2.1.21.

132. *urukramasyākhilabandhamuktaye samādhinānusmara tadviceṣṭitam*. 1.5.13b.

133. *yamaniyaṁāsanaprāṇāyāmapratyāhāradhāraṇādhyānasa-mādhayo' ṣṭāvaṅgāni*. *Yoga-sūtra* 2.29.

134. *yamādhībhiryogapathaiḥ kāmaloḥbhahato muhuḥ, mukundasevayā yadvat tathā*" *tmāddhā na śāmyati*. 1.6.36.

135. See 11.16.42-44.

136. See 11.19.33-35a.

137. To be exact, the *Yoga-sūtra* does not speak of *bhakti*, but only of *īśvara-praṇidhāna*. Vyāsa uses the word *bhakti* only once, in his comment on 1.23.

people—at least some of them—practised *bhakti*.¹³⁸ It should also be noted that in the *Yoga-sūtra īśvara-praṇidhāna* is but one of the five *niyamas*,¹³⁹ and *śamādhi* can be attained by other means as well.¹⁴⁰

In the *BhP* Viṣṇu occupies a unique position. He is not merely the lord of *yoga* and universal teacher,¹⁴¹ but the ultimate goal of man, being most worthy of his love.¹⁴² Hence without *bhakti* the *aṣṭa-aṅga-yoga* is futile, as Kṛṣṇa tells Mucukunda :

O King, the mind of those practising the *prāṇāyāma* and the other yogic aids, but who are devoid of *bhakti*, is seen to be repeatedly disturbed as their passion has not yet been subjugated.¹⁴³

Thus according to the *BhP*, *bhakti* is not one of the means which the *yogi* is free to choose. It is the basis of all *yoga*, and no other way is as good as *bhakti*.¹⁴⁴ The *bhakti* advocated by the *BhP* is not merely an intellectual disposition, but involves the whole man,¹⁴⁵ and as such centres round the *avatāra*. The *Yoga-sūtra* and the *Vyāsa-bhāṣya* have nothing to say about this concept.¹⁴⁶ Since *bhakti* for Viṣṇu is the highest goal of human activity, the *bhakta* can afford to ignore the supernatural powers associated with

138. *Yoga : Immortality and Freedom* (London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 2nd ed., 1969), pp. 73-6.

139. *śaucasamītoṣatapaḥsvādhyāyeśvarapraṇidhānāni niyamāḥ*. 2.32.

140. *īśvarapraṇidhānād vā*. 1.23. Note carefully the particle *vā*. Vyāsa introduces this *sūtra* thus : *kimstaemādevā' sannatamaḥ samādhir bhavati, athāśya lābhe bhavatyanyo' pi kaścīdupāyo na veti*.

141. *yoga-īśvara*, 1.8.43b; *akhila-guru*, *ibid*.

142. *preṣṭhaḥ san preyasāmapi*. 3.9.42a.

143. *yuṣṭjānānamabhaktānām prāṇāyāmādibhir manah, akṣīnavāsanam rājan dṛṣyate punar utthitam*. 10.51.61.

144. *na yujyamānāyā bhaktyā bhagavatyakhilātmani, sadṛśo' sti śivaḥ panthā yoginām brahmasiddhaye*. 3.25.19.

145. Cf. Anand : "Bhakti : the Bhāgavata Way to God", pp. 193-5.

146. Vācaspati Misra, Bhoja and some other commentators, following the *Yoga-sūtra*, maintain a silence with regard to the concept of *avatāra*. Vijnānabhikṣu and Nāgabhāṭṭa deny it, for *īśvara* is beyond all action. Nārāyaṇatīrtha admits the doctrine of *avatāra*. Cf. Karnatak : *Op. cit.*, pp. 116-7.

yoga;¹⁴⁷ indeed, he has to be fully detached from them, lest in being attached to them, he may miss the real goal of his struggle.¹⁴⁸

The *BhP* goes beyond the goal set by the *Yoga-sūtra*. The calming of one's self cannot be a goal in itself, because that would mean a vacuum. The mind can only reach complete calm when it attains its highest object, and this is God. According to the *BhP*, God can be fully attained only through *nirguṇa-bhakti*. Since God completely fulfils man, the *bhakta* needs nothing else, not even the *siddhis*.¹⁴⁹

Bhakti as the best mārga

From the above discussion we can now summarize what the *BhP* has to say to the question of Uddhava. The *BhP* not only states that the other *mārgas* remain incomplete without *bhakti*, but also avers that all the *mārgas* find their consummation only when they lead to *bhakti*. This is not merely our conclusion, but is explicitly stated by the *BhP* :

For a man who has come into this world there is no other way more favourable than that which leads to steadfast devotion to Lord Vāsudeva.¹⁵⁰

Thus *bhakti* is the end to be achieved by following the *mārgas*.¹⁵¹ We have also noted that for the *yogī*, *bhakti* is the best path.¹⁵² This explains why Nārada, confirming the teaching given to Dhruva by the latter's mother, tells him :

The way shown to you by your mother will help you to attain the highest good : Vāsudeva is the Lord. Worship him with

147. aṣṭa-aṅga-anupravṛtta-aśvarya, 3.25.37a.

148. yadā na yogopacitāṣu ceto māyāsu siddhasya viṣajjate'ṅga, ananyāhetuṣvatha me gatih syād ātyantiki na mṛtyuhāsaḥ 3.27.30.

149. Earlier we have discussed how *bhakti* leads to *ātma-tuṣṭi*. Cf. Anand : *art. cit.*, 207-8. We may also note that the *BhP* speaks of *bhakti* as *ātma-prasādinī* (1.2.22b).

150. See above, note 70.

151. na hyato'nyaś śivaś panthā viśataś saṁsṛtāviha, vāsudeve bhagavaṭi bhaktiyogo yato bhavet. 2.2.33.

152. See above, note 144.

your mind fixed on him.¹⁵³

Thus *bhakti* to Vāsudeva is the best means to attain the highest goal of man. Just as the fire burns down the wood, just as the sun dispels the darkness, so too *bhakti* removes sin.¹⁵⁴ *Bhakti* breaks the knot of ignorance.¹⁵⁵ By *bhakti* man can more easily overcome his nature,¹⁵⁶ his natural inclinations,¹⁵⁷ his senses.¹⁵⁸ Only when a man's heart is filled with love for the Lord, can he easily renounce the world,¹⁵⁹ can he overcome all his desires.¹⁶⁰ In short, by *bhakti* man attains all those spiritual benefits made available to him by other spiritual means. No wonder then, that Kṛṣṇa concludes his exposition of the three *mārgas* with this assurance :

Whatever a man can obtain by rituals, penance, knowledge, renunciation, *yoga*, alms-giving, or by other pious exercises,

-
153. jananyabhihitāṅ panthāḥ sa vai niḥśreyasasya te,
bhagavān vāsudevastam bhaja tatpravaṇātmanā. 4.8.40.
Śrīdhara Svāmin, the most authoritative commentator on the *BhP*, has this to say on the verse just quoted : niḥśreyasasyābhipretārthasya panthāḥ ko' sāvitṛyata āha bhagavānvāsudevo'ta eva tam bhaja.
Thus Vāsudeva is both : the goal and the way to the goal !
154. kecit kevalayā bhaktyā vāsudevaparāyaṇāḥ.
agham dhunvanti kārtsnyena nīhāramiva bhāskarāḥ.
6.1.15.
yathāgniḥ susamṛddharcīḥ karotyedhāmsi bhasmasāt,
tathā madviṣayā bhakti ruddhavaināmsi kṛtsnaśaḥ.
11.14.19.
155. tvam pratyagātmani tadā bhagavatyananta
ānandamātra upannasamastaktau,
bhaktim vidhāya paramām śanakairavidyā
granthim vibhetsyasi mamāhamiti prarūḍham. 4.11.30.
156. ... jītvā prakṛtiṁ baliṣṭhām. 3.5.46a.
157. tadā rajastamoḥbhāvāḥ kāmaloḥbhādayaśca ye,
ceta etairanāviddham sthitam sattve prasīdati. 1.2.19.
rajas-tamas-apaha-bhakti. 1.5.28b.
158. bādhyamāno'pi madbhakto viṣayairajitendriyaḥ,
prayaḥ pragalbhayā bhaktyā viṣayair nābhībhūyate.
11.14.18.
159. vāsudeve bhagavati bhaktiyogaḥ prayojitaḥ,
janayatyāśu vairāgyam jñānam ca yadahaitukam. 1.2.7.
160. niḥspṛhaḥ sarvakāmebhyaḥ kṛṣṇapādābhjasevayā. 1.12.14b.

all that can be attained easily by my devotees through the *bhakti-yoga*.¹⁶¹

Conclusion : Bhakti, the goal of spiritual discipleship

In the Indian tradition the concept of spiritual discipleship is very conspicuous. Already in the *Atharva-veda* we have the earliest reference to it.¹⁶² What is the goal of discipleship ? We can now answer the question with full confidence. As the *BhP* presents *bhakti* as the best means to attain God, the best internal disposition to experience Him, it follows that the goal of spiritual discipleship cannot be anything else than *bhakti*. Lest there be any doubt on this matter, the *BhP* makes its mind quite clear.¹⁶³ Hiranyakaśipu fondly questions his son about the best lesson he has learnt.¹⁶⁴ Prahlāda's answer is clear and simple :

To hear about Viṣṇu, to sing about Him, to remember Him, to touch His feet, to offer gifts to Him, to bow to Him, to be a slave unto Him, to be a constant companion for Him, to surrender oneself totally to Him, in short, the ninefold devotion to Viṣṇu, that I believe to be the best lesson a man can learn.¹⁶⁵

Prahlāda finds nothing better for man to learn than the ninefold *bhakti* to Viṣṇu. The highest learning is to be imparted only to a pupil who has really proved himself. Thus, only when the sages are pleased with the devoted service, maturity and genuine

161. yat karmabhiryattapasā jñānavairāgyatāśca yat,
yogena dānadharmena śreyobhiritarairapi,
sarvaṁ madbhaktiyogena madbhakto labhate'ñjasā.
11.20.32-33a.

162. See 11.5. This hymn is a eulogy of *brahmacarya*. The teacher is the spiritual mother of the *brahmacārī* (verse 3).

163. Cf. Anand : "Spiritual Discipleship as Described by the Bhāgavata-Purāṇa."

164. uttama-adhīta, 7.5.22a.

165. śravaṇaṁ kīrtanaṁ viṣṇoḥ smaraṇaṁ pādasevanam
arcanam vandanaṁ dāsyam sakhyamātmanivedanam,
iti pūmārpitā viṣṇau bhaktiscennaivalakṣanā
kriyate bhagavatyaddhā tanmanye'dhītamuttamam.
7.5.23-4.

faith of Nārada, do they impart to him the most secret knowledge, the knowledge imparted to them by the Lord Himself.¹⁶⁶ Thus an initial *bhakti* is required from the aspirant before he can be accepted as a pupil. This initial *bhakti* can make up for all other defects, thus enabling all—even women and Śūdras—to qualify for spiritual discipleship, as Kṛṣṇa told Uddhava.¹⁶⁷

166. jñānam guhyatamaṁ yattat sākṣādbhagavatoditam,
anvavocaṁ gamiṣyantaḥ kṛpayā dīnavatsalāḥ. 1.5.30.

167. sādhave śucaḥ e brūyād bhaktiḥ syācchūdrayoṣitām,
11.29.3.

THE SAHYĀDRIKHAṆḌA : STYLE AND CONTEXT
AS INDICES OF AUTHORSHIP IN THE
PĀTITYAGRĀMANIRŪPA

BY

STEPHAN HILLYER LEVITT

[सह्याद्रिखण्डनामधेयं पुराणं भागद्वययुक्तमुपलभ्यते । अस्य 'आदिरहस्य'-
नामके प्रथमे भागे स्कन्दपुराणीयं ज्ञानयोगखण्डं वर्तते, किञ्चित् परिवर्तित-
रूपेण । उत्तररहस्यनामके द्वितीये भागे ब्राह्मणोत्पत्तिविषयकं विवरणं
दृश्यते । चतुष्प्रकरण-विभक्तोऽयं भागः; अस्मिन् महीशूर-(Mysore)-
प्राप्तीयानां ब्राह्मणानामुत्पत्तिः, उत्तरदेशाद् ब्राह्मणानाम् आगमनम्, प्रात-
हरिजम् (= पातित्य)-अवस्थानां ब्राह्मणानामुत्पत्तिः, परशुरामचरितं च—
इति चत्वारो विषया यथाक्रमं चतुर्षु प्रकरणेषु विवृताः ।

उत्तरार्धस्य कोशे बहु वैचित्त्यम् अवलोक्यते; अस्य बहवः पाठा भ्रष्टाः
प्रतीयन्ते । एषु प्रकरणेषु रचनाशैलीभेदोऽपि लक्ष्यते ।

उत्तरार्धस्य तृतीयं प्रकरणमेकादशाध्याययुतं पातित्यग्रामनिर्णय-
नामकम्; येषु ग्रामेषु पतिताः (शूद्राचाराः) ब्राह्मणा निवसन्ति, तेषां
विवरणम् प्रदत्तम् । एतत्प्रकरणगता अष्टौ अध्यायाः 'तुलुवग्राम-द्वृत्ति' नामके
ग्रन्थेऽपि दृश्यन्ते । ग्रन्थेऽस्मिन् नवेतिवृत्तानि प्रोक्तानि । निबन्धे एषामिति-
वृत्तानां विवरणं विस्तरेण प्रदत्तं लेखकेन ।

लेखकेनोक्तम्—अस्य भागस्य सर्वे अंशा नैककालिकाः, न सर्वाणि
इतिवृत्तानि समानकालिकानि । अस्मिन् शब्दप्रयोगे वैचित्त्याणि लक्ष्यन्ते—
मूर्धन्यवर्णानां प्रयोगबाहुल्यमपि अत्र दृश्यते ।

पुराणसदृशा ग्रन्था अवशिष्टे कालेऽपि विरचिता इत्यत्र ग्रन्थोऽयमपि
प्रमाणभूतमित्युपसंहृतं लेखकेन ।]

1. The *Sahyādrīkhaṇḍa* (Skh), or Book of the Sahyādrī Range
of Mountains, in the compendium of chapters which has come
down to us, is divided into two parts. The first part, the *ādirahasya*
contains primarily chapters of the *Jñānayogakhaṇḍa* of the *Skanda-*

purāṇa, perhaps with some rearrangement.¹ Within this there is interpolated a large section on the origin of *kṣatriya* groups in the Mysore area. The second part, the *uttarārdha*, *uparibhāga*, or *uttarahasya*, is devoted entirely to the origins of *brāhmaṇa* groups in the area. It can be divided into four sections. These discuss respectively the origins of the major *brāhmaṇa* groups in the Mysore area, the introduction of *brāhmaṇas* from the north into the area by the 4th c. Kadamba king Mayūravarman, the origin of groups of *brāhmaṇas* of Harijan status in the area, and the god Paraśu-Rāma. The latter is a god of particular reverence in the Mysore region. He generally is identified as a god of *brāhmaṇa* descent who was so enraged by *kṣatriyas* lording over *brāhmaṇas* that he cut down the *kṣatriyas* 21 times, calculated 7×3 . This calculation can be understood to indicate entirety, thereby indicating the thoroughness of his action.

In the manuscript colophons of sections of the *uttarārdha*, we have evidence of three different numbering systems which have been applied at one time or another to some of the chapters of this part of the Skh. Similarly, the manuscripts demonstrate three levels of corruption with each more corrupt than the preceding level. The different numbering systems and levels of corruption correlate with one another. The numbering systems alone indicate that at one time these chapters were attached to the Skh in a different fashion than at present, and that at still another time some chapters had been located in a different context. From these points, we can deduce that while the present *uttarārdha* of the Skh was in its formative stages, parts of its text were already corrupt.

As we have the text today, the four sections of the *uttarārdha* of the Skh are stylistically distinct from one another.

The second section which discusses the introduction of *brāhmaṇas* from the north into the area by Mayūravarman, for example, is written in simple declarative sentences with simple Sanskrit vocabulary. The few verses which describe the physical features of the area at the very beginning of this section, however, demonstrate a different Sanskrit style of image heaped on image so as to

1. See S. H. Levitt, "The *Sahyādrīkhaṇḍa* : Some Problems in the Textual Criticism of a Puranic Text", in *Purāṇa* 19.1 (January 1967), 16-7, and *Purāṇa* 21.1 (January 1979) Table III, 77-9.

form a lengthy hyperbole. This contrasts with the simple declarative style of the rest of these chapters. The same description is found as well toward the beginning of the third section on *brāhmaṇas* of Harijan status. In the latter section these verses are also somewhat disjunctive. This suggests that we have here a stock description which an author could draw on at will. Suggested as well is that these verses may have been added in both contexts at the time of placing the second and third sections of the *uttarārdha* next to one another. It can be noted further that in the manuscripts, these sections appear to already have been placed next to one another by the time of our earliest numbering system for the chapters of the *uttarārdha*. This numbering system can be associated with our best manuscripts of the text.

The fourth section, which continues reference to Paraśu-Rāma from the earlier sections, is composed of two chapters of the *Reṇukāmāhātmya* as in some manuscripts of the text. The *māhātmya*, or glorification, traditionally is attached to the SKh. The style of these chapters is not one of simple declarative sentences, and it contrasts with the second section of the *uttarārdha* as much as it does with the third. It is clear that this section of the *uttarārdha* was attached to it for reasons of theme. It is not clear, however, at which point in the growth of the text it was so attached. It appears already in manuscripts demonstrating the second stage of corruption. But there is no evidence of it in its present position in the best manuscript of this group. Manuscripts containing the text in its earliest stage of corruption are incomplete. While it is doubtful that this section was attached at this time, we cannot be certain without clear testimony.

The third section titles itself *Pātityagrāmanirṇaya* (PGN). It is a discussion of villages of *brāhmaṇas* fallen from status, that is, of kin groups of *brāhmaṇas* of Harijan status. That these *brāhmaṇas* are of Harijan status is made clear in the text over and over again in its reference to them as having *śūdra* status. This is the standard *varṇa* in which Harijans are classed in Sanskrit literature outside the Tamil-speaking region.² Such groups of *brāhmaṇas* of Harijan

2. See I. Karve, *Hindu Society—An Interpretation* (Poona : Deccan College Postgraduate and Research Institute, 1961) 48, and J. N. Bhattacharya, *Hindu Castes and Sects, an exposition of the origin of the Hindu caste system and the bearing of sects towards each other and towards other religious systems* (Calcutta : Thacker, 1896), 254-69, etc.

status are not uncommon in India. The various volumes listing the castes and tribes in India which were compiled during the British period contain reference to approximately 100 such groups. The various district gazeteers and other sources contain reference to even more such groups. It was from such a group which had raised its status that such notable figures in modern Indian history as Debendranath Tagore and Rabindranath Tagore came.

The PGN, as in the Skh as this has been handed down to us, is composed of 11 chapters. At least 8 of these chapters also are to be found in the *Tuḷuvagrāmapaddhati*, a discourse on Tuḷu villages.³ The text as in the best *Tuḷuvagrāmapaddhati* manuscript is most closely related to the less preferred manuscript in the first group of our relevant Skh manuscripts and to the most preferred manuscript in our second grouping of these manuscripts. Those readings which are shared with the manuscript in the second grouping, however, are with the less preferred readings which agree with other less preferred manuscripts.

In a critically edited text of the PGN⁴ certain stylistic features emerge which contrast certain of the chapters with one another as much as these contrast with the preceding grouping of chapters on the introduction of *brāhmaṇas* from the north into the area by Mayūravarmaṇ, let us say. Similarly, certain points contrast

-
3. Compare the contents of this text as outlined in B. A. Saletore, "The Tuluva Gramapaddhati", *S. Aiyangar Commemoration Volume* (Madras : The Committee, 1936), 116-7, and the sections of text reproduced and discussed in B. A. Saletore, *History of Ancient Kāṇṇāṭaka, vol. 1—History of Tūḷuva*, Poona Oriental Series 53 (Poona : Oriental Book Agency, 1936), 124-5, 310-8, 442-9, with the text of the PGN. Saletore's text is extremely corrupt, as are as well all other individual manuscripts of the PGN. His discussions should be viewed with extreme circumspection. A large number of points have been misconstrued on account of bad readings and interpolations which were not recognized to be such.
 4. See S. H. Levitt, *The Pātityagrāmanirṇaya : A Puranic History of Degraded Brahman Villages* (Dissertation, Philadelphia : University of Pennsylvania, 1973), available from Xerox University Microfilms, Dissertation Copies; P. O. Box 1764, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106, U. S. A. — Order No. 74-14,100, as listed in *Dissertation Abstracts International* vol. 34/12 (June 1974), 7711A.

sections of text within individual chapters with other parts of the same chapters. This constitutes further evidence of the growth of this *purāṇa* text, and provides further indication of the way in which a *purāṇa* tradition expands. M. Winternitz wrote in his *Geschichte der Indischen Litteratur* that with regard to the *Mahābhārata* "the date of each section, nay sometimes of each single verse of the *Mahābhārata* must be determined separately...."⁵ What is true with regard to *itihāsa*, it appears, is also true in this regard for *purāṇa*. Both *itihāsa* and *purāṇa*, of course, are in old sources such as the *Śāṅkhāyanagr̥hyasūtra* classed together as *itihāsapurāṇa*, and in the *Arthaśāstra* and the *Amarakośa* they are defined in part in terms of one another.⁶

2.1 Within the 11 chapters of the PGN there are 9 histories. All except the last two are one chapter in length each. The first two histories are so closely related that they also can be understood as a single story. They are, nevertheless, distinct in that each history discusses a different generation. The last two histories are two chapters in length each. In the case of the last two histories, neither chapter can stand without the other. Their format is different from that of the preceding stories.

Interestingly, for the last two histories the chapter numbering system which can be associated with the second level of corruption breaks down. While this numbering for the earlier chapters, 88-90, 191-193, 174 can be understood to indicate chapters numbered 88-94, the last four chapters are numbered 175, 194, 124, and 125. This perhaps can be construed as chapters numbered 95, 94, 94, and 95 when we consider possible misreadings.⁷

Indicated here is an expansion of the tradition at this point, possibly the loss of a different chapter 95, and a reluctance to numbering any of these chapters above 95 as if chapter 96 was

5. See M. Winternitz, *A History of Indian Literature*, trans. Mrs. S. Ketkar, 2 vols. (1927; Rpt. New York : Russell, and Russell, 1971), 1 : 469.
6. See E. Sieg, "Itihāsa", in J. Hastings, *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics* (New York : Charles Scribner's Sons, 1913), 7 : 461b-2a, and S. H. Levitt, "A Note on the compound *pañcalakṣaṇa* in Amarasinha's *Nāmaliṅgānuśāsana*", in *Purāṇa* 18.1 (Janury 1976), 25, 32, and foldout.
7. See S. H. Levitt, "The *Sahyādrīkhaṇḍa* : Some Problems", in *Purāṇa* 19.1, 19-21.

firmly associated with decidedly different material. To be noted here is that the best manuscripts, which are, it is true, incomplete, do not extend to these chapters or to the overly brief chapter before these. It is possible that we have here indication that these chapters were not attached to the text at this time. We must be cautious here, however, as these manuscripts also show no evidence of the sixth history, which story clearly is integral to the core of our text.

2.2. Three of the stories begin with a formulaic phrase. The third history begins :^a

pātityagrāmam asty anyat śuktimatyaś ca dakṣiṇe |
modagrāmam [tad] ity āhuḥ.... .. ||

There is another village of *brāhmaṇas* of fallen status to the south of the Śuktimatī River. It is called Modagrāma,.....

The fourth history begins :

pātityagrāmam asty anyat koṭiliṅgeśasamnidhau |

There is another village of *brāhmaṇas* of fallen status near Koṭiliṅgeśa.

The seventh history begins :

pātityagrāmam asty anyat cakranādyās taṭe śubhe |
nānāgrāmam tad ity āhuḥ..... ||

There is another village of *brāhmaṇas* of fallen status on the splendid shore of the Cakranādī River. It is called Nānāgrāma.....

To be emphasized is that not all the histories begin in this way. While the formulaic phrase is rigid, its usage is not so. In contrast, the eighth history, while it begins in similar fashion, breaks with the rigid formula :

vakṣyāmi rājaśārdūla grāmam anyad bahiṣkṛtam |
velaṅṅīti tad ity āhuḥ sītāyās cottarodhasi ||

-
8. In quotations from the PGN, emendations in the text are placed in brackets. When these emendations involve a certain degree of uncertainty, a question mark has been indicated at the appropriate place in the accompanying translation.

O tiger-like king, I will speak of another cast out village. It is called Velañji. On the northern bank of the Sītā River... Similarly, the tenth history begins :

anyad [grāmaṁ] pravakṣyāmi bhūdevasya mātmanah |

I will speak of another village of a noble *brāhmaṇa* (god upon earth).

We have evidence here of an attempt to follow the formula found in some of the chapters, but without rigid adherence to it. When taken together with other points discussed both above and below, this can be understood to reflect here different authorship.

2. 3. All the histories in the PGN end in similar fashion.⁹ The single exception to this is the first history, the events of which are continued in the second history so as to form two related but discrete stories. From history to history there does appear to be some variation. In part, though, this may be due to corruption in the manuscripts. The second chapter ends :

*bahunātra kim uktena kim anyac chrotum icchasi |
eteṣāṁ darśanāt puṁsāṁ pātityaṁ sambhaviṣyati |
prāyaścittavidhiṁ vakṣye mātāpṛasāvalokanam ||*

What else is there to say? What else would you desire to hear? People become fallen in status from seeing these. I will recite an appearance of Mārtaṇḍa, a formula for expiation....

The third chapter ends :

*eteṣāṁ darśanāt sadyaḥ pātityaṁ anugacchati |
prāyaścittavidhiṁ vakṣye caṇḍāṁśor darśanam param ||
bahunātra kim uktena nātra kāryā vicāraṇā |*

At the moment one sees these he loses status. In order to provide expiation I will state the highest vision of the sun.

9. The verses which occur at the end of the first three chapters will not be considered here as they constitute a separate topic. In two instances, they appear to be integral to the penances prescribed. They are indicated here by three dots after the sections of text concerned. At the end of the first chapter, such a verse is added without introduction. Its content is consistent with that of the other two verses, however. Such verses do not occur after the third history.

What is there to say aside from this ? There is no discussion to be made with regard to this.....

The fifth chapter ends :

*teṣāṃ saṃsargamātreṇa pātityam anugacchati |
tatpāpavinivṛttiyartham mārtaṇḍam avalokayet ||
bahunātra kim uktena punar anyam vadāmi te ||*

By association with them one becomes fallen in status. To put an end to that sin one should look up to Mārtaṇḍa. What else is there to say ? I will speak still more to you,

The sixth chapter end :

*teṣāṃ darśanamātreṇa pātityam prāpnuvanti hi |
prāyaścittavidhānam tu mayā vaktum na śakyate |
tatrāpi samakāle tu koṭimārtaṇḍadarśanāt ||
tadā pūtā bhaviṣyanti nātra kārya vicāraṇā |
bahunātra kim uktena grāmam anyam vadāmi te ||*

People obtain fallen status simply by looking at them. The only atonement I can prescribe is to look at the sun the same length of time, but a million (*koṭi*) times longer. Then they will be purified. There is not to be any discussion with regard to this. What else is there to say ? I will speak to you of another village.

The last two stories end in similar fashion, but they contrast with the rest of the chapters on two accounts. The sentence, *bahunātra kim uktena*, is modified to include direct reference to Śatānīka, to whom the text is being recited. The author appears to find difficulty in stating the penance prescribed in one instance, and has the group itself performing the penance, or so it seems, in the other instance. Thus, in the eighth history the text reads :

bahunātra kim uktena rājaśreṇiśiromaṇe ||

O jewel in a line of kings, what is there to say aside from this ?

In the ninth history the text read :

bahunātra kim uktena rājan rājendranandana |

O king, son of the best of kings, what is there to say aside from this ?

In the eighth history, this is followed by :

teṣāṃ darśanamātreṇa pātityaṃ cānuyāsyati |
prāyaścittam mayā vaktum na śakyam nṛpaṇandana ||
sādhāraṇenaiva vakṣye kṛcchracāndrāyaṇam caret ||

Simply by looking at them one will become fallen in status. O prince, it is not possible to speak an expiation. I will speak generally. Let one perform a *kṛcchra* or a *cāndrāyaṇa*.

In the ninth history, this is followed by :

apañkṛtyā [nām]eteṣāṃ narāṇaṃ nīcavartinām||
bhuñjānānām adharmāṃś ca gaṅgāsnānaṃ vidhīyate|
sadā teṣāṃ..... ||
dvādaśaśāb [dān] pravastavyaṃ vārāṇasyāṃ na saṃśayaḥ||

For these men with whom no meals can be eaten, living in a low condition and indulging in unrighteousness, a bath in the Ganges River is prescribed. Always they....will have to travel to Vārāṇasī for twelve years, without a doubt.

In all the preceding histories, the appropriate penance in every case involved the sun and included explicit mention of the sun. This is not the case in either instance here. We have here difference both in style and content.

2.4. It is not clear that the penances at the end of the earlier chapters are always integral to the text. A notable instance of this uncertainty occurs at the end of the fourth history, though there are similar instances at the end of the second, third, and fifth histories as well, for instance. In the fourth history, Paraśu-Rāma removes the sin of the *brāhmaṇas* so that they are, in the word of the text, *niṣkalaṅka*, or "stainless". The text then states :

bahunātra kim uktena nirbhītāḥ saṃcaranty aho|
 What else is there to say. They live without fear.

It then, however, adds :

teṣāṃ darśanamātreṇa pātityaṃ labhate naraḥ||
prāyaścittavidhiṃ vakṣye saṣṭhakaḥ [āsanam] caret||

Merely by seeing those a man obtains degradation. I will speak an expiation. Let one do an *āsana* (?) at noon.

Toward the end of the fifth history we find a statement of a type not uncommon toward the end of these stories that beginning then the group concerned is illustrious (or, ruling) in the place concerned. The text then, however, adds :

*[tā]su jātā mahābhāga śūdra eva na saṁśayaḥ||
teṣāṁ saṁsargamātreṇa pātityam anugacchati||
tālpāpavinirṭtyartham mārtaṇḍam avalokayet||
bahunātra kim uhtena punar anyam vadāmi te||*

O king, the children of those women are without a doubt śūdras. By association with them one becomes fallen from status. To put an end to that sin one should look up to Mārtaṇḍa. What else is there to say. I will speak still more to you.

Toward the end of the second history, this prohibitory section is comparatively lengthy. The end of the fourth history is particularly interesting in that this section in the fourth history may be part of or an addition to a possible second conclusion to the story. These two sections are discussed below (2.7). They provide additional reason for suspecting that the penances at the end of the earlier chapters may not be integral to the text.

2.5. It also is not clear if the seventh history has the same authorship as the preceding histories. This chapter is so short that it appears in context to be fragmentary. On the basis of its few verses, however, its style appears to be more straightforward and simpler than that of the preceding chapters. Verbal forms are simple, subordinate phrases are simple, sentence structure is simple. Its statements are brief. For instance :

*mayūravarman sa purā medhāvī ballabhiṁ prati||
rāmeṇa nirmītaṁ vipraṁ vāhayitvā ca vāhanam||
siṣṭān [viprān] samādāya punaḥ soapuram āyayau||
grāmapradānasamaye procur bhārgavanirmītaḥ||*

The learned Mayūravarman previously had his litter carried to Ballabhi by the brāhmaṇas who had been created by Rāma. Taking with him learned brāhmaṇas he returned home. At the time of giving villages, those created by the Bhargava spoke.

Compare this with the following extracts from the fifth and sixth histories which use lengthier sentences, more subordinate

clauses, more adjectives, more difficult vocabulary, and which literally pile in more imagery.

aṅgavaṅgakaliṅgebhyaḥ saurāṣṭrād gujja[rāt] tathā||
āndhradraviḍakarṇāṭakāśmirebhyaḥ tathaiṣa ca|
mahārāṣṭroka[lābhy]ām ca sindhumāgadha....||
gauḍagorāṣṭradeśābhyaṁ parityaktā vitantiṣaḥ|
saṁjātāḥ purṇagaḥ bhīṇyaḥ kṛtāśrāddhavigarhitāḥ||
ākalparahitā nāryaḥ kṣutpipāsātipiditāḥ|
mīlitoḥ tāḥ samāyātāḥ tuṅgabhadrāntikāṁ nrpa||
tīrastham advayaṁ śāntaṁ virūpākṣaṁ mahēśvaraṁ|
nāryaḥ sarvāḥ samāviṣṭāḥ ślutiṁ kartuṁ pracakramuḥ||
tatrāpaśyan mahābhāgaṁ nāsāgrakṛtalocanam|
kaṇvaṁ nāma mahābhāgaṁ śataghasrādi[ka]prabham||

Abandoned widows from Aṅga, Vaṅga and Kaliṅga, from Saurāṣṭra and from Gujjara, from Andhra, Draviḍa, Karṇāta, and Kāśmīra, from Mahārāṣṭra and from Utkalā, from Sindhu and Māgadha...., and from the countries of Gauḍa and Gorāṣṭra, pregnant women forsaken forever, despised because they had not performed the funeral rites (?), afflicted by hunger and thirst, having met one another, O king, came together near the Tuṅgabhadrā River. Together all the women began to make a *stotra* to the kind great god Virūpākṣa who stood, unique, on the shore. They saw there a great lord with his glance fixed on his nose, the great lord named Kaṇva with the splendour of a hundred dawns.

purā dhvajotsave ramye candradatta-narādhipe|
nānādeśāt samāyātāḥ nānāvārṇā dvijā[da]yaḥ||
brahmakṣat[ri]yaviṣṭūdrā vivarṇāḥ śābarādayaḥ|
sarve te cotsavaṁ dṛṣṭvā jāgmuḥ tatra yathāgatāḥ||
janasammarditaḥ kācit kanyāḥ śābarasaṁbhavaḥ|
vyastastābhūt tadā bhūpa sundarī pañcahāyanā||

Once, when Candradatta was king, the different classes beginning with the twice-born—*brāhmaṇas*, *kṣatriyas*, *vaiśyas*, *śūdras*, low people such as Śābaras and so forth—came from different regions to the enjoyable banner festival. After seeing the banner festival all those went from there as they had

come. O king, as a result of the confusion of people a certain girl of Śabara descent, a beautiful girl who was five years old, became separated.

Further, while the beginning of the seventh history adheres to the formula outlined above, the end is not the standard ending. The standard ending has been discussed above. In this story, however, we find :

bahunātra kim uktena sarvakarmabahiṣkṛtāḥ||

What else is there to say except that they were excluded from all brahmanical rites ?

As in all the histories preceding it except the sixth, there is a positive statement about the group concerned immediately preceding this statement. But there is no prescription of a penance.

2.6. Within the body of the text of the PGN, there are several short sections of text which contrast in style, content, or both style and content with surrounding sections of text.

One such section, the description of the land toward the beginning of the first story, has been noted above. Uncertainty regarding the standard endings of these stories has also been noted. In both instances, this material is present in the manuscripts which represent the first stage of corruption and earliest numbering system for this text.

Another such instance of a passage which contrasts contextually in style or content also occurs toward the beginning of the first history. In this section of text there is related in brief the origin of the Kroḍeśa tīrtha. The passage is juxtaposed with little connection to an account of Paraśu-Rāma coming to the Sahyādri range of mountains, to which brief account the description of the land is attached. Stylistically, it is perhaps too brief to contrast with the following passage on the surface. Contextually, though, it is anomalous.

Further, after the description of the land in the first history, a 20 verse *stotra* is spoken by Paraśu-Rāma. This *stotra* breaks with the standard *śloka* metre of the rest of the text. It also differs in style from the rest of the text in that it is composed entirely of compounds which serve as laudations in the vocative case one on

top of another. While the *stotra* follows contextually, as does the description of the land, it is not clear that its authorship is not as independent of the main narrative of the PGN as is the description of the land. We cannot be certain, though, since we lack testimony to this such as we have for the description of the land. Such *stotras*, however, are commonplace. V. Raghavan once remarked that such literature commonly was scribbled on scraps of paper in India. It would not be unreasonable to assume that its authorship was independent of the PGN, but that it was included here on account of its appropriateness and its literary merit.

In instances such as these in the first chapter of the PGN, the juxtaposition of stylistically different sections of different authorship appears to have been effected by the author of the PGN himself. In the instance of the endings of the chapters, if these contain material of different authorship, they would appear to have been added by a different hand. They must be considered to be an integral part of the tradition, however, on account of their consistency from chapter to chapter and their seeming textual integrity. In other instances, though, this is not the case.

In the fourth history, for example, there is a lengthy section of commentary within commentary, and of elaborate and detailed ritual narrative which is not characteristic of the text. At some points, this section of text breaks with the standard *śloka* metre, breaking in fact with all metre. On account of the stylistic differences and contextual inappropriateness of these passages, they clearly are interpolations of later date than the text in which they are embedded. They are not integral to the text at any level.

In another instance, in the second history, brief scornful statements which are contextually inappropriate are added in a listing of occupations practised by the group with which the history is concerned. While they also are brief statements of occupation, they are clearly interpolations on account of the difference in tone between them and the text proper.

In such instances, we have in the transmitted text of the PGN interpolations of spurious passages pure and simple.

2.7. One of the most clearcut differences in style in these chapters emerges from difference in the vocabularies used by the

last two histories (four chapters) when compared with the earlier histories. On account of the brevity of the seventh history, consideration is not extended to it here. Little can be determined in its regard from its 13 verses by the type of analysis to be noted here.

In the first six histories, retroflex consonants occur, but their occurrence is not as frequent as in the last two histories.¹⁰ In the first history, approximately 71 retroflex consonants occur in the narrative section of the text. This section of text occupies 52 verses. As pointed out above, there is in this history a lengthy *stotra* to Viṣṇu as well. Retroflex consonants for this *stotra* have not been tabulated since its style is so radically different from that of the rest of the chapters. In the second history of 50 verses, approximately 96 retroflex consonants occur. In the third history of 46 verses, there are approximately 73 retroflex consonants. And in the fourth, fifth, and sixth histories of 49, 33, and 35 verses respectively, approximately 105, 47, and 48 retroflex consonants occur in each.

Within these stories, the larger number of retroflex consonants in the fourth history can be accounted for in part by the names of the two villages concerned occurring 8 times. The name of each of these contains a retroflex consonant. In the main, however, the larger number of retroflex consonants in this history, as well as in the second history, can be accounted for by what may just be the nature of the vocabulary associated with certain topics or, far more likely, by style toward the end of these histories. In both of these histories, there is a section of 10 or 11 verses at the end which concludes the stories, condemns and places restrictions on the people discussed, and then provides penance for contact with the groups concerned. In the case of the second story, 7 of these verses are extraneous to the conclusion of the story. In the case of the fourth story, they provide what may be construed as a second conclusion to the story. These verses provide support for the suggestion, offered above, that there may have been tampering

10. Retroflex ɭ, which in Sanskrit is an allophonic variant of ɭ only, is not considered here. The manuscripts are not consistent between recording ɭ and ɭ in their readings.

with the endings of these histories. In the other histories, however, the tampering would not have extended to as many verses. In both instances here, these verses contain a greater concentration of retroflex consonants than the preceding portions of the chapters. Of the 96 retroflex consonants of the second story (50 verses), approximately 32 are in the last 11 verses, 23 in the last 7 verses. And of the 105 retroflex consonants of the fourth story (49 verses), approximately 28 occur in the last 10 verses. This reduces the number of retroflex consonants occurring in the earlier portions of these histories to 64 retroflex consonants in 39 verses, or 73 in 43 verses, and to 77 retroflex consonants occurring in 39 verses. It is to be noted that in the fourth story, the positive statement about the group concerned, referred to above, may have been retained but displaced in the rewriting of the ending for reason of parallelism with the other histories. Similar parallelism of composition is, of course, in evidence in the last two histories.

In contrast to this data, the first chapter of the eighth history, in 44 verses, contains approximately 99 retroflex consonants, and the second chapter of this history, in 60 verses, contains approximately 120 retroflex consonants. Similarly, the first chapter of the ninth history, in 37 verses, contains 101 retroflex consonants. The last chapter, showing less significant contrast, but contrast nevertheless, contains in its 42 verses approximately 77 retroflex consonants.

This data is charted below, together with a breakdown of the occurrence of retroflex consonants. The total occurrence of retroflex consonants for the second and fourth histories are set off to the side on account of the circumstances outlined above, and an asterisk is placed next to reference to these histories so as to indicate these circumstances. Below these totals, in parentheses, are given the total occurrence of retroflex consonants for the first 43 and 39 verses of these histories respectively. All figures should be understood to be approximate only in order to leave allowance for incorrect readings in the edited text. This is necessary on account of the extreme corruption of the manuscripts. The largest occurrence of each retroflex consonant in an individual chapter is in bold type.

TABLE I

	t	th	ḍ	ḍh	ṇ	ṣ	Total	Number of Verses
History 1	11	0	5	0	31	24	71	52 vss.
*History 2	11	6	10	1	34	34	96	50 vss.
							(73)	(43 vss.)
History 3	11	5	2	4	21	32	75	46 vss.
*History 4	15	1	8	1	30	50	105	49 vss.
							(77)	(39 vss.)
History 5	3	1	7	0	15	21	47	33 vss.
History 6	11	0	3	0	10	24	48	35 vss.
Histories 1-6	62	13	35	6	110	185	442	265 vss.
							(391)	(248 vss.)
History 8a	13	10	3	3	27	43	99	44 vss.
8b	14	2	4	1	43	56	120	60 vss.
History 9a	17	6	6	1	27	44	101	37 vss.
9b	17	2	4	0	26	28	77	42 vss.
Histories 8-9	61	20	17	5	123	171	397	183 vss.

RATIOS :

183 vss. : 248 vss. = 7.4:10, roughly 3:4. Occurrence of retroflexes roughly 25% higher in Histories 8-9.

183 vss. : 265 vss. = 6.9:10, roughly 2:3. Occurrence of retroflexes roughly 22% higher in Histories 8-9.

As can be seen, a contrast exists primarily for t, ṇ, and ṣ. In order to see clearly the contrast for ṇ and ṣ, which letters account for the greatest number of retroflex consonants occurring, we must take into account the number of verses for each history. Thus, while History 8a has four fewer occurrences of ṇ and 19 more occurrences of ṣ than History 1, it has 8 fewer verses. While History 9a has six more occurrences of ṇ and 12 more occurrences of ṣ, it has 9 fewer verses. The greatest occurrences of t, th, ṇ, and ṣ in a single chapter occur in the last two histories. On the other hand, the greatest occurrences of ḍ in a single chapter occur in the first six histories. When we consider the total occurrences for the first six histories as a group as against the last two, and take into account the difference in the number of verses represented in each group, we find a significantly greater number

of occurrences of *ṭ*, *th*, *ṇ*, and *ṣ* in the last two histories, and a significantly greater number of occurrences of *ḍ* in the first six histories. For instance, Histories 8-9 have approximately 33% more occurrences of *ṭ* in their 183 verses than do Histories 1-6 in a corresponding number of verses. Histories 1-6 have approximately 66% more occurrences of *ḍ* than would Histories 8-9 in an equivalent number of verses. The occurrences of *ḍh* do not provide a clearcut contrast.

Not entirely clear is the situation with regard to the second chapter of the last history. To be kept in mind is that its total number of retroflex consonants, while significantly less than the occurrence of retroflex consonants in the other three chapters of the last two histories, remains nevertheless somewhat greater than the occurrence of retroflex consonant in the earlier histories in almost every instance when the number of verses involved are considered. Also to be noted is that large sections of this chapter remain very corrupt and that there occurs in this chapter quotation from elsewhere. Suggesting mislection is that the occurrence of individual retroflex consonants in this chapter is on par with the occurrence of individual retroflex consonants in other chapters in the last two histories in all cases except in the instance of *ṣ*. What appears to have happened is that *ṣ* has been misread at some point in the transmission of the text.

3. In short, on the basis of style and the numbering of the chapters of the *uttarārdha* of the Skh in the manuscripts, we have evidence of multiple authorship for this section of the *uttarārdha* alone. This extends to differences in the format of the histories, differences in the use of formulaic phrases, questionable continuity at certain points, differences in syntax, and differences in vocabulary. In the main, these points indicate different authorship for the last two histories (four chapters) as against the first six histories. They may indicate also still another authorship for the seventh history. Tampering with the text is indicated by spurious interpolations in the first six histories, and may be indicated for the endings of the histories. Also in evidence is that set verses were incorporated in the text perhaps from the period of its initial authorship, perhaps from the period when different sections of the *uttarārdha* were placed next to one another. In some cases, clear interpolations into the narrative can be removed from the

text proper. In other instances, possible interpolations cannot be removed without better testimony from the manuscripts which might resolve certain questions, or on account of these interpolations being integral to the text in its present environment.

What is particularly significant here, however, is that we have in the *uttarārdha* of the Skh, and in the PGN in specific, evidence of the formation and growth of a *purāṇa* tradition in a format brief enough that we can compare and contrast certain parameters of style. This allows us to see in clear relief certain aspects of the patchwork nature of such a tradition. The text provides, in short, an excellent example of the development of a *purāṇa* tradition which, in its turn, can help us understand better our larger *purāṇa* texts.

SCHEMES IN THE PURĀṆAS*

(A First Approach)

By

GIORGIO BONAZZOLI

[पुराणानि सदैव विकाशं प्राप्नुवन्त्येव अवलोक्यन्ते; अतएव यथा पुराणगता विषया विचारार्हास्तथा विषयाणां क्रमोऽपि । येन क्रमेण विषयाः प्रतिपादिताः, सोऽपि कमपि हेतुमाश्रित्य प्रवर्तते, न पुनर्यदृच्छया विषया उपस्थापिताः—इत्यभ्युपेयमेव । सोऽयं क्रमो द्विविधः—प्रतिपुराणीयो विषय-क्रमः, सदृशपुराणानां विषयप्रतिपादनक्रमश्च । योऽयं द्वितीयो विभागः, स पुराणसंबद्धानि बहूनि रहस्यानि विज्ञापयति—इति लेखकेन स्फुटं प्रतिपादितम् । विष्णुपुराण-भागवतयोः, अग्नि-गरुडपुराणयोः, वायु-ब्रह्माण्ड-पुराणयोः, मत्स्य-ब्रह्मपुराणयोश्च विषयक्रमे भूयः सादृश्यं दृश्यते, अन्तरान्तरा वैसादृश्यं च । वैसादृश्यमिदं हेतुजन्यम् इति निश्चितमेव । एतद्-हेतु-विषये किरफिल-महोदयेन प्रथमं प्रयासो विहितः; तदुक्तानि कानिचन मतानि सर्वथा युक्तियुक्तानीति विदुषां मतम् ।

पुराणविषयाणामनुक्रमः केषुचित् पुराणेष्वेव समासविस्तराभ्याम् प्रदत्तः । केषुचित् पुराणेषु आदावेव तत्पुराणगतविषयाणां क्रम उल्लिखितो दृश्यते । पुराणप्रतिपादितविषयैः सह पुराणस्थविषयानुक्रमणीप्रोक्तानां विषयाणां सदैव ऐकमत्यं नास्ति—इति प्रसिद्धमेव । अस्य हेतुविषयक्रम-परिशीलनेन विज्ञातुं शक्यते; पुराणोक्तविषयाणां प्राचीनता, प्रामाणिकता, प्रसिद्धता चानुमातुं शक्यते—इति लेखकेन उदाहरणरूपपादितम् ।

निबन्धेऽस्मिन् अग्नि-गरुडपुराणयोः, विष्णु-भागवतपुराणयोश्च संबन्ध-माश्रित्य विचारः कृतः । ब्रह्माण्ड-वायुपुराणादि-विषयक्रमोऽपि अन्तरान्तरा आलोचितः । प्रकरणानां उत्तत्स्थाने निवेशने यो हेतुस्तमाश्रित्य लेखकेन विशिष्टा चर्चा कृता । क्वचित् पुराणेषु प्रकरण-विशेषः पृथक् विभज्य स्थापित इति दृश्यते (यथा गरुडपुराणे प्रेतकल्पनिरूपणात्मको भागः), अस्य पृथग्विभागस्य हेतुरपि विषयप्रतिपादनक्रम-रहस्यज्ञानेन विज्ञातुं शक्यते—इति लेखकेन प्रादर्शितम् ।

विषयप्रतिपादनक्रमे पुराणिकानां काचिद् दृष्टिः शैली वासीत्—इत्युक्तं लेखकेन । किमपि पुराणम् एकपरम्पराश्रितं वा, अनेकपरम्पराश्रितं वा—एतस्य निरूपणमपि विषयक्रमविचारेण कर्तुं शक्यते । इदमपि लेखकेन प्रदर्शितं यद् अष्टावश-पुराण-रचनायाः क्रमोऽपि सहेतुकः ।]

* This article is a revised and enlarged form of the paper read at the Vth World Sanskrit Conference, held in Vārāṇasī from 21 to 26 October, 1982.

Abbreviations : Bd=Brahmāṇḍa; Mt=Matsya; Pd=Padma; Vy=Vāyu; Śk=Skanda.

We have proof that the purāṇic authors had in view the whole complex of purāṇic literature and were constantly trying to put in order the ever growing underbrush of new productions. All the attempts were made towards fixing a purāṇic canon converge to support this impression.¹ The 'purāṇic schemes', i. e. the orderly succession of topics common to two or more purāṇa-s, which we are going to study in this article are a further proof of the command over the purāṇic matter shown by the purāṇic authors.

Studies in the purāṇa-s tend usually to analyse and, so to say, to decompose them in order to find out the time and place of origin, their history, development etc. Even the recent structuralistic approaches² are limited to a myth or group of myths and only vaguely refer to the broader context in which they are inserted. But as the purāṇa-s are 'mosaics', whose pieces are always changing, we run the risk of missing their real meaning if we do not attempt also to see them in their totality. When we have examined all their details and found that the single 'tesserae' of a purāṇa come from such and such *sampradāya*, from such and such time and place or belong to such and such a myth etc. we have not yet given the answer to why such influences took place or took place in that particular way. Even if we need to analyse the single pieces of the composition (whether it is better to do it before or after we have got a complete picture of the composition itself is no matter of our interest now) we have to be careful not to miss the wonderful complex which was born out of all these pieces and stands now in front of us. By dint of examining more and more details we may miss the whole. I am supported in this statement by the attitude of some purāṇic authors who considered the whole very important. The schemes we are going to examine may show the way to prove that purāṇa-s are not only a heap of pieces which happened to come together under the influences of different forces operating on them down the centuries but are a vast harmonious combination of different and sometimes apparently irreducible elements. In other

1. see The Dynamic Canon of the Purāṇa-s, in *Purāṇa*, XXI, No 2 (July, 1979), pp. 116-166.
2. Wendy D. O'Flaherty, *Asceticism and Eroticism in the Mythology of Śiva*, Oxford University Press, Delhi, 1975; M. Biarreau, The Story of Arjuna Kārtavīrya without Reconstruction, in *Purāṇa* XII, No 2 (July, 1970), pp. 286-303.

words, the purāṇa-s are, on a small scale, what Hinduism is at large. The new elements which come from different parts try to break up the unity, but a strong capacity of synthesis puts each new element in its right place and assimilates it. This phenomenon is too well known to insist on it. This article tries to put in evidence one of the manifold attempts towards the above-mentioned synthesis. To be honest, I should say at the outset that even this synthesis produced by the schemes was later decomposed by new factors and so only a few remnants of it are still visible. They are, however, important for understanding a moment in the evolution of a culture and for pointing out a trend of energies which also nowadays is at work in Indian culture. This article will be only a first little step, rather technical indeed, on this line, but hopefully already meaningful.

I first discovered this tendency of the purāṇa-s towards a synthesis or orderly disposition of their topics in common schemes when I was comparing the matters of the Agni and the Garuḍa purāṇa-s. Suddenly appeared a quite definite and close similarity of subjects between the two texts and, what struck me more, a rather similar order in their sequence. The discovery encouraged me to examine also other purāṇa-s. I have to confess that I was no more so lucky, but comparisons between the Viṣṇu and Bhāgavata purāṇa-s and analysis of the Matsya and the Brahma, as well as a re-examination of the study done by W. Kirfel on the Vāyu and Brahmāṇḍa purāṇa-s³ brought further light on the matter. I have not yet examined all the purāṇa-s from this point of view, so the results are only partial.

From the research done till now one point is clear, namely that some purāṇa-s have a very compact and orderly build-up and are strongly related among themselves. To put it in a more specific way, the relation between the Brahmāṇḍa and Vāyu purāṇa-s studied by W. Kirfel is analogically extendable to other cases. Although Kirfel's perspective will have to be modified in this study, yet his findings are the strongest proof of a trend which now appears to be more vast than previously suspected. There seems to be, indeed, a strong external force which gives the purāṇa-s an imprint and uniformity, leaving them though freedom in details.

3. W. Kirfel, *Das Purāṇa Pañcalakṣaṇa*, E. J. Brill, Leiden, 1927, pp. IX-XI.

The aim of this article is, therefore, to present some remarks on the relation between the Purāṇa-s. The remarks are only preliminary, yet they already hint at something which promises to be quite interesting.

PART ONE : PURĀṆIC SCHEMES

1. Cataloguing of topics

To proceed speedily in the work, we have to find, first of all, a reasonable way to compare the topics of the different purāṇa-s among themselves. Although nothing has been systematically done in this field, one can start with the colophons very often available at the end of *adhyāya*-s, which in most cases mention one of the topics narrated in the text. These colophons, rather short, are ideal for a synthetic analysis of the *adhyāya* and so they can be used for this purpose. Unfortunately they are often missing or they lay stress, among the many themes narrated in an *adhyāya*, on topics which are less important or not useful to our purpose. They can, however, be irregularly used as helpful factors in the analysis of the themes of an *adhyāya*.

The *sūci*-s of all the purāṇa-s given in Agni 272, Nārada I. 92-109, Matsya 53, Śiva V, 44.124ff., and Skanda VII. 1.2 are, with the exception of the Nārada, too short and describe only those topics that were supposed to be narrated in the period when such *sūci*-s were composed. They match neither among themselves nor with the present purāṇic matter except in rare cases. They are useful for discovering the attempts of fixing a purāṇic canon more than in describing the contents of the extant purāṇa-s. But as Nārada's *sūci*-s are longer and still matching casually with the extant purāṇa-s they can be used now and then.

As for the summaries of a specific purāṇa which are often available in the opening or concluding *adhyāya*-s, they can be used but with considerable moderation, because not infrequently they do not correspond to the real content of the purāṇa. In some cases, they seem to be descriptions of ideal purāṇic matter and they are often meant to be recited as separate *adhyāya*-s for religious purpose.⁴ So

4. see A General Introduction to the Brahmavaivarta Purāṇa. Its Anukramāṇikās and their Significance, in *Purāṇa* XVII, No 2 (July, 1975), pp. 118 ff, especially pp. 143-147.

they constitute a topic by themselves and do not fit in well with our scope.

As for the summary of the *adhyāya*-s that each purāṇa has, as every other printed book, at the beginning of the text, they are really 'tables of contents' describing the actual text as it is offered to the readers and so we can be sure that they mention the subjects really dealt with in the purāṇa. Some scholars have even prepared separate lists of topics available in one or more purāṇa-s.⁵ Both the tables of contents and these lists of topics are quite valuable and useful but they necessarily limit their field to the important subjects of each *adhyāya* which are not always the topics an *adhyāya* has in common with another one. The purāṇa-s, in fact, in their evolution may have undergone a disarrangement in their topics. The same important subject in two purāṇa-s may have remained important in one and been given secondary weight in another. This discrepancy does not appear in the above mentioned table of contents and lists, which giving only the important topics, leave unnoticed the topics that have become secondary. So we are left with no chance to make the necessary comparison. In order to discover all the topics of the *adhyāya*-s we should then proceed to a very detailed analysis of the text cataloguing all the single and minor sub-divisions of the subjects. But this, it seems, would kill the text overburdening the analysis with unimportant details without making any substantial contribution. Such an analysis, indeed, does not appear to be necessary. What we really need most is a 'comparative' list of subjects. We have to analyse a text with an eye already fixed on another one so that the common topics may stand out clearly. This way of proceeding used in the following analysis, although rather approximate, seems already significant enough to rebuild the general trend of a purāṇa and it is more adherent to the reality of living texts which do not admit of too modern sophisticated methods of research.

While cataloguing the topics of a purāṇa we have to keep in mind also the relative freedom the authors, whoever they were, took for themselves in dealing with their subjects and the influence of

5. Cf Y. Tandon, *A Concordance of Purāṇa-Contents*, V. I. Series 3, Hoshiarpur (V. I. P.), 1952; Madhvācārya Ādya, *Viṣṇupurāṇa Viśayānukramāṇi*, All-India Kashiraj Trust, Vārāṇasī, 1966; R. S. Bhattacharya, *Subject Index to the Agni Purāṇa*, Bharatīya Vidyā Prakāśan, Vārāṇasī, n. d.

places and circumstances which caused marginal or minor changes in the sequence of the topics themselves. In our analysis, therefore, we shall keep an eye on general themes as well as on details. For instance, if in the correspondent *adhyāya* of two purāṇa-s, one deals with different kinds of bath and the other with different *pūjā*-s, we shall classify those two subjects under the general item '*karmakāṇḍa*'. However, if in both the purāṇa-s we find the description of *pūjā*-s in the corresponding *adhyāya*-s, we shall lay emphasis on this specific fact and shall classify them under '*pūjā*' in both cases. The first correspondence is already enough to identify the sameness of trend, but the second one is naturally more meaningful.

2. The Agni-Garuḍa purāṇa relation and its extension to the Matsya purāṇa.

a.—The Agni and Garuḍa purāṇa-s seem to be the two purāṇa-s which match the most, apart from the Vāyu and Brahmāṇḍa which will be considered below. The Agni purāṇa (ĀSS) has 11,457 *śloka*-s and the Garuḍa purāṇa (Jivānanda Vidyāsāgara Ed.) has 8,738 *śloka*-s. The two purāṇa-s then are substantially different in their length, but they are identical in being both encyclopaedic in character. The number of their *śloka*-s almost coincides with the figure given in Agni 272.11,21 and the details of their contents correspond fairly closely to the description of Nārada I. 99 and 108 except in a few particulars. We could even compare the two *adhyāya*-s of the Nārada purāṇa which give their summary, but it seems more advisable to give another summary to stress the similarities in the subjects and their sequence.

(see Table No 1 in the Appendix)

The comparison between the two purāṇa-s is very instructive. The first evident point is that they have really a quite similar structure. The parallelism is so evident that in some cases it helps to point out important themes which at first appear of minor value in one purāṇa as they are hidden inside other subjects or to leave apart some topics which apparently are important because they are dealt with at some length. For instance, theme No 2 of Garuḍa (*avatāra*, only a few *śloka*-s) could be evidenced by seeing the importance it has in the corresponding No 2 of the Agni purāṇa at this point of the scheme. Also No 10 of the Garuḍa (*manvantara*) was brought to light in this way although not immediately apparent for its being in

an alien context—it is in fact in *adh.* 87, included in the previous topic (*tīrthamāhātmya*) of *adhs* 81-90. This was possible for its perfect parallelism with No 10 of the Agni, also dealing with '*manvantara*'. The same thing can be said of Agni No 13 (*karmakāṇḍa*, *adhs* 263-270), inserted in the previous topic '*veda-s*' of *adhs* 251-272, for its correspondence with Garuḍa No 13 '*karmakāṇḍa*'. The whole process will become clearer as we proceed. One thing, however, can already be said at this point, namely that the comparison of the two schemes shows an evident common plan which stands out strongly even through the idiosyncrasies of each purāṇa. From this it appears also that the whole purāṇa in its entirety is more important than its single parts. But we shall revert again to this point in a short time.

The second thing which stands out clearly from this comparison of the Agni-Garuḍa schemes is that each scheme is, in its turn, divided into sections or units. These units are 'groups of subjects' floating, as it were, in the fluid magma of a purāṇa. Such units are classified with a roman number from I to VII in the above scheme. We shall see that the Matsya purāṇa, while following basically the general scheme of Agni-Garuḍa, shifts the topics dealt with in units V of Agni-Garuḍa to its own unit II and vice versa. It is noteworthy that in this case what is transferred from one place to another is not a single topic but the whole unit. A unit is quite compact in itself and easily recognizable, although in its interior the single elements composing it may be disposed in different ways in different purāṇa-s. For instance, Agni's unit III has the sequence '*tīrthamāhātmya*'-'*bhuvanakośa*'-'*jyotiṣa*'—let us say conventionally 'a-b-c'—the correspondent Garuḍa's unit III contains the same topics as Agni but in the sequence 'b-c-a', namely '*bhuvanakośa*'-'*jyotiṣa*'-'*tīrthamāhātmya*'. The prevalence of the entire purāṇa as a compact whole and the clear-cut floating units do not, however, exclude the presence of isolated topics occasionally introduced without any specific link with other adjacent subjects. Such is the case, for instance, of the topics '*vāyujaya*' and '*asvāyurveda*' of the Garuḍa purāṇa (No 18 in unit VI), which have no direct relation with the preceding topic '*mantra-s*' (No 17), nor with the following '*vyākaraṇa*' (No 19). The same thing can be said of '*asvavāhana*' in Agni purāṇa (No 16) which has no correspondent topics in Garuḍa purāṇa and no relation with the context in which it is inserted.

The units of which we are talking seem to be 'circles of subjects', in which the main topic is somewhat a magnetic centre around which all the others are disposed through a 'sympathetic attraction'. So, for instance, in unit I the topic '*avatāra*' (No 2 in both the purāṇa-s) attracts or develops naturally the topic '*śṛṣṭi*' (No 3); and in unit VI the topic '*mantra*' (No 17 in both the purāṇa-s) is linked with the topic '*karmakāṇḍa*' or '*pūjā*' (cf No 18 of Agni) etc. All this is done, however, with great freedom. For instance, in unit I we can note that while Agni's '*jagatsarga*' has incorporated the topic '*vaṁśa*' as a kind of sub-topic, Garuḍa's '*śṛṣṭi*' has no other subject included in itself.

This relation between units and single topics can lead to some further considerations. Agni No 6 deals with the topic '*tīrthamāhātmya*'. The sequence of *adhyāya*-s is :

adh. 108 *bhuvanakośa*; *adhs* 109-117 *tīrthamāhātmya*; *adhs* 118-120 *bhuvanakośa*.

This sequence reveals that in fact the topic *tīrthamāhātmya* is in the Agni purāṇa only a sub-topic of the broader subject '*bhuvanakośa*'. Such a relation, however, does not appear in the corresponding section of the Garuḍa purāṇa where '*tīrthamāhātmya*' not only is not included in the topic '*bhuvanakośa*' but is even separated by another subject, namely '*jyotiṣa*' (No 8). So the same topic can be either linked with other sub-topics or can appear independently. This procedure deserves greater attention as it is repeated in several cases : see Agni No 3 '*jagatsarga*' (*adhs* 17-20), which includes '*vaṁśa*' (*adhs* 18-19); Agni Nos 12-13 '*veda-s*' (*adhs* 252-272) with incorporated '*karmakāṇḍa*' (*adhs* 263-270); Garuḍa Nos 9-10 '*tīrthamāhātmya*' (*adhs* 81-90) which absorbed '*manvantara*' (*adh* 87) etc. We define this phenomenon as a tendency to 'inclusion', through which a topic swallows up, so to say, the other one in itself. Or can we speak of 'ring procedure' by which the same topic is re-assumed repeatedly. For instance, if we take Agni No 3 '*jagatsarga*' (*adhs* 17-20) with included '*vaṁśa*' (*adhs* 18-19), we see that the real sequence of topics is : '*jagatsarga*' (*adh* 17)-'*vaṁśa*' (*adhs* 18-19)-'*jagatsarga*' (*adh* 20); the same for Garuḍa Nos 9-10 which has the sequence '*tīrthamāhātmya*' (*adhs* 81-86) - '*manvantara*' (*adh* 87) - '*tīrthamāhātmya*' (*adhs* 88-90). It seems as if a topic considered more important, is repeated as a kind of echo. This gives the

result of 'concentric circles' where one of the themes is in the middle, included, so to say, in the other one which stands around it.

From what we have said till now, at least two main conclusions can be drawn for the study of the purāṇa-s. The first is that only in some cases single topics are to be considered and studied separately; they should rather be approached in the light of the context because they really form a compact unit with that specific context which gives them its own connotation. The second conclusion is that the whole purāṇa forms a unit by itself and constitutes the real and ultimate context both of the units and of isolated topics. So even if we consider a purāṇa as a mosaic of many pre-constituted independent units or subjects, we cannot decompose it into the original elements lest we destroy the mosaic itself. Each purāṇa has its own independent life and unity which are to be grasped in their entirety and specific structure if we want to perceive what makes that purāṇa unique. If the single units are separated for a while to examine them more closely, they have to be reunited immediately to the whole, lest we fail to reach the right interpretation. It seems easy to conclude from all this that studying a purāṇic topic in isolation from its units or specific purāṇic context is running the risk of misunderstanding it completely.

Moreover the stress we are here laying on the scheme of a purāṇa may lead us to find also its different layers of systematization. If two purāṇa-s have the same scheme, i. e. they deal with the same topics in the same order, we can suppose that the topics which are common to both of them were introduced in the purāṇa-s probably at the same time or at least that they represent the same current or layer, while the topics which appear to be outside the common scheme belong possibly to a different layer. In both cases the matter used in the purāṇa-s can be taken from material already well systematized outside the purāṇa itself in books or systems. An example outside the common schemes is Vāyu II. 211-225 on the musical theory⁶, while the *Dharmavantarīsamhitā* of Garuḍa 146-194 is an example of matter—surely already organized outside the

6. See A. Danielou, N.R. Bhatt, *Textes des Purāṇa sur la theory musicale*, Vol. I, Publications de l'Institut Français d'Indologie, No 11, Pondichery (Institut Français d'Indologie), 1959.

purāṇa-s—common to more than one purāṇa. The reasons underlying the insertion of the two topics in the two purāṇa-s are different, the latter is the parallel with the common scheme; the former should be looked for in other more specific influxes that purāṇa underwent in its evolution. So the approach itself, while studying the two themes, must be different. The 'historical' analysis of the text points out when that particular passage was composed, the 'scheme' analysis helps us to discover when and under which forces it was inserted in the purāṇa-s.

This stress on the necessity of considering the common purāṇic schemes has not to lead us to overlook the idiosyncrasies of each purāṇa in dealing with the single topics. The two purāṇa-s we are just examining, namely the Agni and the Garuḍa, have a similar scheme and yet they have distinct individualities and the purāṇic authors themselves put them in two different categories, namely the Agni in the tāmasa and rājasa purāṇa-s and the Garuḍa in the sāttvika ones.⁷ The same is true also for the Brahmāṇḍa and the Vāyu, which not only have the same scheme but in many cases even the same words. They are also to be considered at present as two different purāṇa-s with their own peculiarities.

Another remark of some importance can be made by examining Agni No 5. The two topics of this number, namely 'buildings' and '*devatāsthāpana*' are repeated twice, in *adhs* 38-70 and then in *adhs* 92-106. Here the fact stands out clearly because the repetition is done immediately, with the sole interruption of *adhs* 71-91 (*karma-kāṇḍa*). In other cases such repetitions are spread all along the purāṇa as it happens, for instance, for the group '*avatāra-sṛṣṭi*', i.e., Nos 2-3 of unit I in the Matsya purāṇa. Such a group is repeated in three different places as a kind of refrain or 'constant', namely in Nos 2-3 and then in *adhs* 163-175 after No 10 and in *adhs* 243-250 after No 16 of the Matsya purāṇa. Each purāṇa can have its own peculiar refrain or constant which is not less important than the specific topics proper to that purāṇa.

A last remark can be made, keeping in mind that while the Garuḍa purāṇa has no division of *khaṇḍa-s* or the like, the Garuḍa purāṇa besides the *Pūrva-khaṇḍa* examined by us, has also an *Uttara-khaṇḍa* which is not taken under consideration here, because it has

7. See below, page 169.

no correspondence in the Agni purāṇa. This seems to imply that some additions to the purāṇa-s were made when the power of the schemes or the strong unity of the purāṇic topics was still felt and so if topics had to be added they had to be put in a separate part. The clearest proof of this are the Brahmāṇḍa and Vāyu purāṇa-s which have a common scheme ending with the usual conclusion of a purāṇa but then they have added, later than Nārada purāṇa I. 92-109, by way of appendix, two different topics, namely Lalitā-upākhyāna (Bḍ. III. 5-40) and Gayā-māhātmya (Vy II. 43-51) respectively.

So the process of systematizing the purāṇa-s according to schemes or common patterns lasted only some time. As every attempt to fix the purāṇic matter, this also failed in the long run and the purāṇa-s continued to evolve, leaving only vague remnants of the attempt made.

b.—After this rather quick comparison between Agni and Garuḍa purāṇa-s we shall analyze the relation, if any, of these two purāṇa-s with other texts, to discover whether the scheme we have analysed in them is common also to some other purāṇa.

The Matsya purāṇa seems to be, among the purāṇa-s I have examined for this preliminary research, the closest to them. It has 14,062 śloka-s in the ĀSS; it is, therefore, considerably longer than the other two we have examined and almost double than the Agni. The scheme given in the Appendix is compared with the Agni-Garuḍa group, as it follows their same pattern. In this case also the content of the Matsya is almost exactly matching with the one given in Nārada I. 107. (See Table II in the Appendix)

As already noted above, the peculiar feature of this purāṇa is the refrain of the two themes '*avatāra-sṛṣṭi*', which recur three times and each time, it is not difficult to note it, the theme '*sṛṣṭi*' assumes new tones and perspectives which cannot surely be perceived if we analyse it outside the context in a sort of asceptic way.

The topics Nos 4-6, which partly constitute unit II of this purāṇa, correspond to unit V of the Agni-Garuḍa scheme, which is put here at the beginning of the purāṇa and arranged in a way different from Agni's and Garuḍa's. It remains, however, easily

recognizable. The comparison of this unit (namely II of the Matsya and V of the Agni-Garuḍa) in the three purāṇa-s is rather interesting.

<i>Matsya P.</i> Unit II	<i>Agni P.</i> Unit V	<i>Garuḍa P.</i> Unit V
4. <i>Vaṁśa adhs</i> 11-51	12. <i>Veda-s (Purāṇa- itihāsa) adhs</i> 259-272	—
5. <i>Kriyāyoga adh</i> 52	13. <i>Karmakāṇḍa adhs</i> 263-270	13. <i>Karmakāṇḍa adhs.</i> 116-137 (<i>Dharmaśāstra- vrata</i>)
6. <i>Purāṇa-s adh.</i> 53	14. <i>Vaṁśa adhs</i> 273-278	14. <i>Vaṁśa adhs.</i> 138-142
—	—	15. <i>Rām.-Mbh. adhs.</i> 143-145
<i>Dharmaśāstra adhs</i> 54-101		

We cannot escape the impression that we have here a purāṇic unit in its becoming. The three subjects of this unit seem to have developed from a single one, which through a sort of sympathetic attraction has gathered around itself other topics. A subject like 'Rāmāyaṇa' and 'Mahābhārata' (see Garuḍa No. 15) or even 'Purāṇa-s' (see Agni No. 12), could be easily attracted by a topic like 'vaṁśa' (see Agni and Garuḍa No. 14). On the other hand the 'Itihāsa-purāṇa' was not unnaturally linked to the 'Vedas' (see Agni No. 12), which in their turn could develop liturgical matter for their link with sacrifice (see Agni-Garuḍa No. 13). We supposed, then, that unit V was originated by one topic, namely 'vaṁśa'; its prevalence both in length and position in the Matsya would confirm it. The epics and purāṇa-s were easily attracted around it and, on their turn, recalled by way of sympathetic connexion or analogy the Veda-s which were spontaneously linked with *karmakāṇḍa*. Once the topics had developed in a purāṇa they remained as constitutive elements of the unit and influenced the other two purāṇa-s. That the topics 'purāṇa-s', 'vedas' and 'karmakāṇḍa' are secondary appears from the fact that 'karmakāṇḍa' of Agni-Garuḍa (No. 13) is not a substitution for 'kriyāyoga' of the Matsya (No. 5) as we shall see immediately and so the two subjects are independent; that the subject 'purāṇa' was omitted in the Garuḍa and that the 'veda-s'

do not appear in the Matsya. On the other hand that the hypothesis of the appearing of this unit II (or V) is not only imaginary can be seen by comparing the three purāṇa-s with their summary in the Nārada purāṇa.

For Agni purāṇa, Nārada I.99.15ff says :

राज्यामिषेकमन्त्रोक्तिर्द्वर्मकृत्यं च भूभुजासु ॥

रामोक्तनीतिनिर्देशो रत्नानां लक्षणं ततः ।

धनुर्विद्या ततः प्रोक्ता व्यवहारप्रदर्शनम् ॥

(cf. No. 11 of the scheme)

वेदासुरविमर्दाख्या ह्यायुर्वेदनिरूपणम् ।

(cf. No. 16 of scheme)

So here the whole unit V is omitted; it had not yet entered the purāṇa.

For Garuḍa purāṇa Nārada I. 108.12cd ff. says :

जननाख्यं प्रेताशौचं नीतिशास्त्रं व्रतोकयः ॥

(cf. Nos 11-12 of scheme)

सूर्यवंशः सोमवंशोऽश्वतारकथनं हरेः ।

(cf. No. 14 of scheme)

रामायणं हरेर्वंशो भारताख्यानकं ततः ॥

(cf. No. 15 of scheme)

The topics '*vaśīṣṭa*' (No. 14) and '*purāṇa-s*, Mahābhārata' (No. 15) are already present, but '*karmakāṇḍa*' (No. 13) is missing. We have supposed that it was introduced under the influence of a previous introduction of the topic '*veda-s*'.

For Matsya purāṇa, at last, Nārada I. 107.8 says :

कीर्तनं पुरुवंशस्य वंशो ह्यौशाशनः परम् ।

क्रियायोगस्ततः पञ्चात्पुराणपरिकीर्तितम् ॥

(cf. Nos. 4-6 of scheme)

Here the whole unit is already present as in the extant text. So it is not difficult now to reconstruct the process of formation of this unit. At the time of Nārada I. 92.109 it was present in the Matsya in the same place and in the same order as we have it now. Its two main points were '*vaśīṣṭa*' and '*purāṇa-s*'. It had already

been assumed by the Garuḍa purāṇa in a reduced form, namely without '*kriyāyoga*'; only '*varṇśa*' and '(purāṇa)—*ītiḥāsa*' had been retained. After the composition of Nārada I. 92-109 the Agni purāṇa took them and enlarged them to include also the vedic śākhā-s and liturgical matter (*karmakāṇḍa*) related to the veda-s. It was only at this stage that the Garuḍa purāṇa inserted the topic '*vrata*' which is somewhat half-way between liturgical and dharmaśāstric matters. All this, of course, is valid if the development took place in a logical and consequential way. It remains, anyway, a good basic hypothesis, a solid starting point for research.

If we compare Matsya's scheme with Agni-Garuḍa's we come in touch with another procedure in purāṇic composition. The topics which are given in a frame, in the Table, between Nos 3 and 4 (i. e. '*manvantara*' and '*prithivīdāna*'), between Nos 6 and 7 (i. e. '*dharmaśāstra*') and the topics after the refrain between Nos 10 and 11, (i. e. '*tīrthamāhātmya*' and '*varṇśa*') may be considered a sort of buffer-topics, i. e. matter added to join more important units or to enlarge previous and subsequent topics; they are then not directly parts of the scheme.

The comparison of unit V of the Matsya with the corresponding unit II of the Garuḍa furnishes a further example of what we have already seen above. In Matsya No 14 the topic '*kriyāyoga*' although it is hidden in a completely alien context, namely '*devatāpratiṣṭhā*', could be put in evidence because of the undoubted importance the subject '*yoga*' has in this point of the scheme, as it appears from Garuḍa No 5. Moreover, Garuḍa No 6, which apparently deals with '*dharmaśāstra*' but has a strange appendix on '*aṣṭanidhi*', is to be understood, most probably, in the light of its parallel in Matsya No 16, where the only dharmaśāstric topic dealt with is '*dāna*'. So '*aṣṭanidhi*', although at present a secondary element in Garuḍa No 6 was most probably primary. The three *adhyāya*-s previous to it on '*dharmaśāstra*', then, can be considered as a kind of enlargement by way of introduction to the main topic. So this is a further example of the importance the context and schemes may have.

In the logic of purāṇa-s like the three we are examining, which begin with '*avatāra*' and '*śṛṣṭi*', the topic '*pralaya*' is rightly put at the end. Unit VII of Agni-Garuḍa, which comes after such a topic,

should be considered, then, something outside the basic structure of these three purāṇa-s. We can suppose, however, that the '*paramā gati*' is a topic to be dealt with quite logically after '*pralaya*' and so all the subjects in connection with it, like '*jñāna*', '*yoga*' etc., as we see in the Agni-Garuḍa scheme, may find their reasonable place after it. The parallel with the Matsya does not help in this case because this purāṇa ends with unit V and has no correspondent matter for units VI and VII of the Agni-Garuḍa purāṇa-s.

3.—The Viṣṇu-Bhāgavata purāṇa relation and the Vāyu-Brahmāṇḍa.

a.—Completely different and far more complex is the relation of the Viṣṇu and Bhāgavata purāṇa-s. We do not find in them the rigid scheme we have noticed in the previous three purāṇa-s and the whole arrangement of the topics and the spirit itself are quite different from the purāṇa-s just examined. Yet we can still discern in them a rather large agreement in some of their parts. They are completely different in style and length. Viṣṇu purāṇa has 6,373 *śloka*-s in Jivānanda Vidyāsāgara Edition and is divided into six *aṁśa*-s; the Bhāgavata purāṇa has 14,579 *śloka*-s in the same edition and is divided into twelve *skandha*-s. The general theme, however, is common and their schemes are also mutually comparable. Their comparison is rather instructive even if not so smoothly feasible as in the previous three purāṇa-s.

(see Table III in the Appendix)

The themes have been catalogued under three sections, mainly because of different degree of agreement in the topics.

Before entering into a detailed analysis of this scheme let us first note a process so peculiar to the Bhāgavata in comparison with the Viṣṇu but frequent also in other purāṇa-s, namely the enlargement. It is so common, indeed, that it deserves particular attention because it is one of the causes of the 'deviation' of a purāṇa from the original purāṇic scheme it might have had in common with another one. As we have already seen, there are different ways of enlarging a text: an *adhyāya* or a *khaṇḍa*, a unit, a section, or the whole purāṇa can be developed. We have examples of enlargement at the end of a purāṇa, as in the Garuḍa, Brahmāṇḍa and Vāyu purāṇa-s, where a new *khaṇḍa* or at least a new section is added. We

have enlargements at the beginning of a purāṇa as it appears from the comparison between the Viṣṇu and the Bhāgavata, Section I, as we shall see immediately, or in the middle, as it will be seen in the Vāyu compared with the Brahmāṇḍa (see scheme in the Appendix, Table IV, between Nos 3 and 4). Sometimes the enlargement or rather the deviation from the established scheme, is due to a sort of 'assonance' of topics, as we have already noticed. This process can be responsible for repetitions of topics, as in Agni No 5, where 'buildings' and '*devatāsthāpana*' are repeated twice, or in Matsya after No 10, where the topics '*pralaya*', '*avatāra*' and '*śṛṣṭi*' recall one another reciprocally so that where anyone of them is introduced the others also follow by 'concomitance'. The process of enlargement and specifically of 'assonance' can lead a purāṇa quite far from the original scheme. For instance, the story of Bhagīratha can bring a purāṇic author to continue either with '*vaṁśa*' or with '*bhuvanakośa*' or again with '*dharmaśāstra*', all depending on the stress laid on one point or another of the *kathā*, whether Bhagīratha's family is put in evidence or the descent of the Gaṅgā from heaven or the piety of the king. If we compare the sequence of topics in a purāṇa to a musical sequence we may understand better how each note-*kathā* can lead to an indefinite variety of relations with the next note-*kathā* to compose always new melodies, all depending on the inner sensitiveness of the composer. Sometimes, these variations-deviations are temporary as it is with Vāyu Nos 3-4, but they can be permanent and give a new feature to the purāṇa itself. Examining carefully the process of changing or evolving of schemes in the purāṇa-s would lead us too far now, because we should examine the trends and the forces which made their influence felt on the purāṇa-s down the centuries. We have here surely one of the main keys for understanding the whole process of purāṇic systematization and evolution. Should we enter a little more in the heart of the process we would understand perhaps why some topics are preferably attached to one purāṇa and not to another. So, for instance, why should '*Prayāga mātmya*' be originally linked with the Matsya purāṇa while the '*Kumbha melā*', which takes place at Prayāga, is traditionally linked with the Skanda purāṇa or why was the '*pretakalpa*' attached to the Garuḍa purāṇa and the '*pañcakrośi*' of Vārāṇasī was put in connection with the Brahmavaivarta purāṇa, just to give a few examples at random. All this makes us suppose that even the so-called enlargements or deviations did not take place haphazardly but according

to a logic which escapes our present understanding. Coming back to the two purāṇa-s we are studying here, we discover that in all the three sections the Bhāgavata enlarges, though in different proportion, the Viṣṇu's matter, through repetition of the same theme or through addition of related topics by assonance. The process is especially evident in section I. While the Viṣṇu purāṇa has here only one *adhyāya* as introduction, the Bhāgavata has the whole first *skandha* of nineteen *adhyāya*-s and other four *adhyāya*-s in the third *skandha*. The aim of these *adhyāya*-s of the Bhāgavata is unmistakably introductory as they introduce the characters that will be the interlocutors in the whole text or describe the characteristics of the purāṇa itself. The enlargement is obtained through repetition of the theme 'sṛṣṭi', or other refrains, like 'vaṁśa', through the addition of peculiar themes of Bhāgavata, namely saṁpradāyic and bhaktic topics (see Bhāgavata No 2 - *adhs* II.8-9 - and No 4 - *adhs* III. 27-33) and other ways (compare Viṣṇu No 9 'dharmaśāstra' with the corresponding Bhāgavata Nos 9-11 'dharmaśāstra', 'manvantara', 'avatāra').

The relation of themes in Viṣṇu-Bhāgavata section II is rather loose. But if we consider the whole section as a unit, it is not difficult to discover the same leading lines in both the purāṇa-s. Viṣṇu No 6 'manvantara' corresponds to Bhāgavata No 10 'manvantara' with the same characteristic. The theme 'māyāmoha' of Viṣṇu No 10 can be the vague correspondent of 'avatāra' theme of Bhāgavata No 12. The Bhāgavata purāṇa adds here 'vaṁśa' (No 8) but does not deal with 'veda-s' (see instead Viṣṇu No 7), a theme that this purāṇa will take up only at the end after the conclusion (see Bhāgavata No 18).


Section III is almost equally reproduced in both the purāṇa-s. The Bhāgavata adds new topics after the conclusion (Nos 17 ff), a process already found in other purāṇa-s also.

The comparison of these two purāṇa-s seems to point out that the Bhāgavata is dependent on the Viṣṇu for its scheme, which is followed constantly and, although continuously enlarged or momentarily abandoned, is immediately resumed again. It is evident that in all this process the division into *aṁśa*-s or *skandha*-s is rather external and superficial and it is not linked with the rythm of the schemes.

b.—The Brahmāṇḍa-Vāyu relation has been studied by W. Kirfel. Their interdependence is evident as it extends to the very words, not only to the topics. There should be no need, then, to compare them, especially if we accept Kirfel's view that these purāṇa-s were once only one.⁸ But it is all the same of some interest to analyse them subject-wise and compare them with other purāṇa-s.

(see Table IV in the Appendix)

There is not much to say on these schemes, of course, except noticing the long addition at the end, after the conclusion, especially in the Brahmāṇḍa purāṇa and the insertion in the Vāyu between Nos 3 and 4 which breaks only momentarily the common scheme. We can add however, a note of some interest. These two purāṇa-s seem to have a kind of inner rythm which can be briefly presented in the following way :



The letters a-b-c point out a process of parallel disposition in the themes which correspond reciprocally in a mirror way around a group of topics 'c' standing right in the centre.

We can now compare the Viṣṇu and the Brahmāṇḍa purāṇa-s.

(see Table V in the Appendix)

The two schemes have been given in their essential elements in order to bring out better their relation. The first nine points, as well as the last two (or three, cf. Viṣṇu purāṇa) correspond in the two purāṇa-s. The major difference is between Nos 10-11 (*Kṛṣṇa-*

8. Cf. *op. cit.*, p. X.

vatāra-'*Kaliyugadharmā*') of the Viṣṇu and Nos 10-12 ('*vaṁśa*-'*manvantara*-'*bhuvanakośa*') of the Brahmāṇḍa. And this difference appears exactly there where the Brahmāṇḍa repeats itself (Nos 10-12 '*vaṁśa*-'*manvantara*-'*bhuvanakośa*' are equal to Nos 3-5). We have marked these topics with the letter 'b' in the above scheme. The Viṣṇu purāṇa, instead of repeating the same themes, introduces the new topics '*Kṛṣṇavatāra-Kaliyuga*' (Nos 10-11).

The collation of these two schemes is quite instructive. We can note, first of all, the repetition or 'refrain' of the theme '*vaṁśa*' after No 4 of the Viṣṇu purāṇa; the enlargement in No 13 ('*ādhyātmika*') of the same purāṇa; the buffer-topic of the Brahmāṇḍa (No 6), which has no correspondence in the Viṣṇu and, then, a new procedure, not yet met with in the other schemes. The topic '*vaṁśa*' of the Viṣṇu purāṇa (No 9), although it can be considered correspondent to Brahmāṇḍa No 8 ('*vaṁśa*'), is better seen, from its position after '*dharmaśāstra*' (No 8 of the Viṣṇu), as the correspondent of Brahmāṇḍa No 10 ('*vaṁśa*'). Now, the topic '*vaṁśa*' (No 10) in the Brahmāṇḍa is the beginning of the new unit, i.e., Nos 10-11-12; so Viṣṇu No 9 ('*vaṁśa*') can be also seen as a hint that the Viṣṇu purāṇa had the same scheme as the Brahmāṇḍa but then, possibly by the very reason that this unit (Nos 10-11-12) was a repetition of a previous one (unit Nos 3-4-5), the Viṣṇu changed and followed other schemes and introduced '*Kṛṣṇavatāra*' and '*Kaliyuga*' (Nos 10-11). The topic '*vaṁśa*' (No 9) remains as a remnant or a kind of hook which signals the point where the two schemes divided.

A last remark can be made by comparing the position of the subject '*manvantara*' of the Viṣṇu purāṇa (No 5) which we have linked in this scheme with the previous topics, namely '*vaṁśa*' and '*bhuvana kośa*' (Nos 3-4) to form a kind of unit parallel to the corresponding Brahmāṇḍa's Nos 3-4-5. Now, this same topic '*manvantara*' (Viṣṇu No 5) was instead joined to the following topics '*Veda-s*' etc. (Nos 6 ff) to form section II of the Viṣṇu purāṇa, parallel to Section II of the Bhāgavata in Table III. Does this topic belong to the previous or subsequent section? The compact unity of Viṣṇu Nos 1-4 and their strong parallelism with the Bhāgavata Nos 1-5 would put the topic '*manvantara*' (Viṣṇu No 5) outside the group in which we have put it in Table V. We are encouraged to do that by

seeing that '*manvantara*' of Viṣṇu No 5 is really corresponding to '*manvantara*' of Bhāgavata No 9. But, on the other hand, the strong parallelism with the Brahmanḍa Nos 3-5 gives a point to its being an element of this very group as we have put in Table V and not of the following one as given in Table III. The strong parallelism between Brahmanḍa and Viṣṇu in Nos 3-5 is re-inforced by Brahma Nos 3-5 (see Table VI), which have exactly the same topics '*manvantara*'-'*vaṁśa*'-'*bhuvanakośa*'. So the topic '*manvantara*' (Viṣṇu No 5) fits well both in the previous unit where we have put it in Table V and in the following where we have put it in Table III. All this seems to point towards a double function of some topics, which should be considered perhaps as different kinds of pivots that can make the purāṇa change its scheme—the one it has in common with others—and turn it towards a new direction.

It is also interesting to note that the theme '*vaṁśa*' occurs three times in both the purāṇa-s (cf. Viṣṇu Nos 3,4,9 and Brahmanḍa Nos 4, 8, 10), but its function in the 'economy' of the two texts is different. This appears to be a further proof that the topics should not be examined in isolation but in relation with the function they have in the whole purāṇa.

4. Purāṇic Habits and Heterogeneous Schemes

Besides the schemes we have examined, the purāṇa-s present some peculiar features, trends or habits common to many of them even if not organized in schemes for the whole purāṇa.

The purāṇa-s, indeed, in many cases have a particular and fixed way of joining topics, not haphazardly but in a selective way. They are built up, indeed, according to a logic which, strikingly in some cases, is not inner to them, i. e., the subjects are not always linked among themselves in a logical sequence. The incongruence in the succession of topics may be sometimes, even very often, explained with later additions, but that does not seem to solve all problems. There are, indeed, instances when it seems that a kind of 'habit' or 'selective unions' play an important role in systematizing the sequence of subjects. Some of them might appear natural, like, for instance, the connection between the topic '*bhuvanakośa*' and the topic '*tīrthamahātmya*'. The connection is in this case so natural that where the former is introduced the

latter also very often comes by way of concomitance. But there are cases in which the link between subjects is apparently over imposed, so to say, by forces which are outside the inner and normal development of the subjects. In these cases the purāṇa may not follow anyone of the schemes we already know of but it is, not improbably, under the influence of 'purāṇic habits', which dictate, for instance, what topics have to be dealt with in the beginning or what should come at the end or again how to build a sequence of themes and so on. We have, of course, to go about slowly in this theory, as we do not possess enough material for its solid basis and fantasy may play a bad trick. Yet there are hints towards what we have just said which should not be underestimated.

For instance, examining the sequence of topics in the Brahma purāṇa we find an interesting fact. The sequence of topics does not correspond to any definite scheme already studied but it recalls two different schemes as if the purāṇa were under different influences.

(see Table IV in the Appendix)

In the beginning the purāṇa follows the sequence or *krama* of subjects we already found in the Brahmāṇḍa and Viṣṇu purāṇa-s. It apparently enlarges the buffer-topic of this latter (Viṣṇu No 6, 'karmakāṇḍa' and introduces a new and long theme 'tīrthamāhātmya' (Brahma No 8; cf already No 5). But from No 10 downward it is influenced by the scheme of the Agni-Garuḍa group; it only inserts its own peculiar refrain 'dharmaśāstra-karmakāṇḍa'. The result of all this is a kind of mixed scheme bearing the imprints of two different schemes. Whether this should be considered new scheme, common to other purāṇa-s or only a mixture of units as a characteristic process of the Brahma purāṇa is not yet clear. Further investigation is needed.

PART TWO : PURĀṆIC AWARENESS OF COMMON KRAMA-S

We have now enough matter to affirm that in some cases at least the purāṇa-s were following a definite scheme or *krama* common to more than one text. Were these schemes followed blindly or were the purāṇic author aware of what they were doing? We should proceed by steps and examine accurately the purāṇic attitude before these *krama*-s.

1. Order of the 18 purāṇa-s

There are passages, indeed not many, which clearly state that the eighteen purāṇas have a particular order which has to be followed.⁹ It is perhaps because of remembering these passages that some authors tried to discover an inner link among the eighteen purāṇa-s which would account for their succession in the purāṇic lists.¹⁰ It is known indeed that the purāṇa-s have 27 lists of the eighteen purāṇa-s,¹¹ twelve of which are equal among themselves—with the only variant of the Śiva or the Vāyu purāṇa at the fourth place—and other nine are quite similar. Such lists follow a definite *krama*, of which the purāṇic authors are aware. Usually no explanation is given for such an order. We find a hint only in Padma IV. 111. 66 ff and that also not for all the purāṇa-s but for eight of them. But even if they do not give any reason they insist that the succession in the order of the purāṇa-s is not haphazardous but क्रमात्, यथाक्रमम् etc.

Skanda purāṇa V. 3.1.14ab says :

तं नमस्कृत्य वक्ष्यामि पुराणानि यथाक्रमम् ।

(cf also śl. 52)

The same purāṇa in VII. 2.2 ab says :

अथ संक्षेपतो वक्ष्ये पुराणानामनुक्रमम् ।

(cf Mt. 53.72)

A little below, śl. 109ab has :

इदमष्टादशानां तु पुराणानामनुक्रमम् ।

The Matsya purāṇa (53.1) says :

पुराणसंख्यमाचक्ष्व सूत विस्तरशः क्रमात् ।

दानधर्ममशेषं तु यथावदनुपूर्वशः ॥

So these texts stress that the purāṇa-s have a *krama* which they follow. Also by giving the names of the purāṇa-s in the lists some

9. See, for instance, Matsya 53.1; Skanda V. 3.1.14ab, 52; VII. 2.2, 166-109ab.

10. Baladeva Upadhyaya, *Purāṇa Vimarśa*, Chowkhamba Vidyābhavan, Vārāṇasī, 1965, pp. 86-89; Giridhar Śarma Caturvedi, *Purāṇa Parīśīlan*, Bihār Rāṣṭrabhaṣā Paṛiṣad, Patna, 1970, pp. 27-33.

11. see The Dynamic Canon. . . *op. cit.*, pp. 132-134, 144-149.

texts¹² stress the orderly succession mentioning their number : so Mārkaṇḍeya purāṇa is called the seventh, Kūrma the fifteenth, Liṅga the eleventh and so on. Skanda V. 3.1.43ab quotes the Matsya as the sixteenth purāṇa according to the order :

मात्स्यं मत्स्येन यत्प्रोक्तं मनवे षोडशं क्रमात् ।

The single purāṇa-s show in some cases full awareness of their place in the list by identifying themselves with that purāṇa having that number : Bhaviṣya purāṇa affirms to be the ninth, Mārkaṇḍeya the seventh, Kūrma the fifteenth etc., exactly as in the lists.¹³

The commonly accepted list follows this order, which we shall call as the 'Viṣṇu's order as it is found in the Viṣṇu purāṇa also 1. Brahma 2. Padma 3. Viṣṇu 4. Śiva (or Vāyu) 5. Bhāgavata 6. Nāradiya 7. Mārkaṇḍeya 8. Agni 9. Bhaviṣya 10. Brah-mavaivarta 11. Liṅga 12. Varāha 13. Skanda 14. Vāmana 15. Kūrma 16. Matsya 17. Garuḍa 18. Brahmāṇḍa. That this succession of purāṇa-s was most probably following a particular order with a specific meaning appears from the three passages we have now to examine. Garuḍa purāṇa, Brahma Khaṇḍa I. 1ff, Padma purāṇa, Uttara Khaṇḍa 263.81ff and Bhaviṣya purāṇa III. 3.28.10ff divide the 18 purāṇa-s according to the three *guṇa*-s into *sāttvika*, *rājasa* and *tāmasa*. As the parts where these passages are inserted are comparatively late we can suppose that the division according to the *guṇa*-s is also rather late, yet it presents interesting features worthy of attention.

If we apply these three-*guṇa* divisions to the purāṇic lists of eighteen purāṇa-s we discover a kind of rythm which does not seem to be casual. As the lists of 18 purāṇa-s are many, it is but natural that the three-*guṇa* divisions fit one or only some of them. We may suppose that the division was prepared for that list where it fits best. Now the three-*guṇa* scheme of Bhaviṣya III. 3.28 fits mainly the list available in the Bhaviṣya itself because it contains the Nṛsimha purāṇa and both the Śiva and the Vāyu, facts which are not repeated in other lists. It fits, however, also the main list the Viṣṇu's and two or three others (see Appendix). As for

12. see Bhaviṣya I. 1.61 ff; Varāha 3.69 ff; Viṣṇu III. 6.21 ff. etc.

13. Bhaviṣya I. 1.69; Mārkaṇḍeya 137.25ab; Kūrma I. 1.21; Liṅga I. 2.3cd; Vāmana 95.36.

the three-*guṇa* divisions of the Garuḍa, and Padma they fit best the list as given in Padma VI. 263, which is equal to the standard one (or the Viṣṇu's III. 6), but puts the Skanda purāṇa at the last but one place and not at No 13 as the usual list does. The Garuḍa's *guṇa*-division, moreover, agrees perfectly also with the lists given in the Kūrma, Śiva VIII. 1.1.43, Padma VI. 219, Liṅga, Śiva V. 44.120 as well as Padma IV. 111. The lists and their relation with the *guṇa*-division are given in the Appendix : here we discuss only one of them to stress the awareness in the purāṇic authors of the link the purāṇa-s have in their succession.

PURĀṆA-S	Guṇa-scheme acc. to Garuḍa	Guṇa-scheme acc. to Padma	Guṇa-scheme acc. to Bhv.
1. Brahma*	T	R	S
2. Padma	R	S	S
3. Viṣṇu+	S	S	S
4. Śiva (or Vāyu)*	S	T	R(R)
5. Bhāgavata+	S	S	S
6. Nāradiya (Āditya for Gḍ)	T	S	—
7. Mārkaṇḍeya	T	R	T
8. Agni	R	T	T
9. Bhaviṣya	R	R	T
10. Brahmavaivarta	T	R	—
11. Liṅga+	T	T	T
12. Varāha*	R	S	S
13. Skanda	—	—	—
14. Vāmana+	R	R	R
15. Kūrma*	S	T	R
16. Matsya*	S	T	R
17. Garuḍa+	S	S	S
18. Skanda	R	T	—
19. Brahmāṇḍa	T	R	T
20. Nṛsiṃha	—	—	R

Note :— S = Sāttvika; R = Rājasa; T = Tāmasa.

* = purāṇa which has been assigned to all the three *guṇa*-s subsequently.

+ = purāṇa which was assigned the same *guṇa* in the three schemes.

The numbers of the Purāṇa-s are given according to the order which appears in Viṣṇu III. 6.

The Skanda after the Garuḍa appears only in Pd. VI. 263; Bhv. gives also Nṛsiṃha and both the Śiva and the Vāyu; Garuḍa substitutes Āditya for Nāradiya.

The sequence of the Garuḍa's *guṇa* list starts and ends with all the three *guṇa*-s which appear in these two places in a mirror succession :

	1. T		3. S
Beginning	2. R	End	2. R
	3. S		1. T

The others are arranged in groups of two purāṇas each having the same *guṇa*. Other arrangements or successions are also possible, the reader will find them easily and so new rythms can be discovered.

The Padma's *guṇa* list presents four groups of four purāṇa-s each. Each group contains all the three *guṇa*-s, one of which is repeated twice in succession. The position of the Skanda purāṇa (No 13) in the order proposed by the Viṣṇu purāṇa (i. e. the standard list) would interfere with the rhythm. To avoid such an irregularity the Padma in its own list given in previous *śloka*-s transposes the Skanda immediately after the Garuḍa—as we have done—and so the rhythm is preserved. We may assume that the shifting of the Skanda purāṇa to the last but one position operated by the Padma purāṇa in this passage is due exactly to the necessity of keeping the above-mentioned rhythm. This would imply that the author of such a list not only was aware of the rhythm but that he considered it more important than the standard and generally-accepted order of the purāṇa-s, namely the Viṣṇu purāṇa's list.

The Bhaviṣya divides the list into three groups of three purāṇa-s each belonging to the same *guṇa* alternated with groups of three purāṇa-s having two purāṇa-s of one *guṇa* and the third one different. The last group concludes with three purāṇa-s, each one having a different *guṇa* in that same succession with which the three-*guṇa*-s groups had been introduced previously. It appears difficult that all such correspondences may be due to a mere accident. It is sounder to think that they were deliberately meant by the authors.

2. Order of the Single Purāṇa-s

At least eight purāṇa-s show clear awareness of being a unit having a definite scheme.

Vāmana 1.10 and Brahmāṇḍa I. 1.168ab affirm it straight-way. The former says :

पुराणं वामनं वक्ष्ये क्रमान्निखिलमादितः ।

The latter has :

अनेनानुक्रमेणैव पुराणं संप्रकाशते ।

Padma II. 125. 40cd-41ab foresees a great merit for the man who hears 'in due order' its five (not yet six as they are at present) *khaṇḍa-s* :

यः शृणोति नरो भक्त्या पञ्च खण्डान्यनुक्रमात् ।

सहस्रगोप्रदानस्य मानवो लभते फलम् ।

The five *khaṇḍa-s* of the Padma have, then, their order which possibly is important and internally linked with the matter itself of the purāṇa. Other purāṇa-s give more details about such an order. The Viṣṇu purāṇa is aware that it is narrating the *pañcalakṣaṇa* in the order given in the usual *śloka* :

सर्गश्च प्रतिसर्गश्च वंशो मन्वन्तराणि च ।

वंशानुचरितं चैव पुराणं पञ्चलक्षणम् ॥

It reminds the readers and listeners of the fact whenever a new topic of the *pañcalakṣaṇa* is started. So at the end of *aṁśa* I it affirms :

इत्येष तैऽशः प्रथमः पुराणस्यास्य वै द्विज ।

यथावत्कथितो यस्मिञ्छ्रुते पापैः प्रमुच्यते ॥

(I. 22.88)

At the beginning of *aṁśa* III it says :

कथिता गुरुणा सम्यग्भूतमुद्रादिसंस्थितिः । 3.1 ab ।

....
मन्वन्तराण्यशेषाणि श्रोतुमिच्छाम्यनुक्रमात् ॥ 3.3 cd ॥

...
तान्यहं भवतः सम्यक् कथयामि यथाक्रमम् ॥ 3.5 cd ॥

Similar things are said in IV. 1.2 for *vaṁśa* and in a clearer way in V. 1.1. :

नृपाणां कथितस्सर्वो भवता वंशविस्तरः ।

वंशानुचरितं चैव यथावदनुवर्णितम् ॥

and then again in VI. 1.1-2 ab :

व्याख्याना भवता सर्ववंशमन्वन्तरस्थितिः ।

वंशानुचरितं चैव विस्तरेण महामुने ॥ 1 ॥

श्रोतुमिच्छाम्यहं त्वत्तो यथावदुपसंहृतिम् । 2 ab ।

So the Viṣṇu purāṇa is always conscious of different topics to be dealt with according to a fixed plan, which is again summarized at the end :

सर्गश्च प्रतिसर्गश्च वंशमन्वन्तराणि च ।

वंशानुचरितं कृत्स्नं मया तव प्रकीर्तितम् ॥ (VI. 8.13)

Although the '*pratisarga*' is dealt with at the end of the purāṇa and not in second place as we would expect from the *śloka* just quoted, yet the purāṇa shows itself to be continuously attentive to the order to be followed in the text.

The Bhāgavata purāṇa is not so particular about emphasizing the regular development of the topics but it is also aware of the inner unity of the whole purāṇa, especially when it mentions topics already narrated—see V. 26.38; VI. 1.1; VIII. 1.1, 6.

The Vāyu and the Brahmāṇḍa purāṇa-s divide their text into four *pāda*-s which will be narrated in due order :

वक्ष्यामि तान् पुरस्तात्तु विस्तरेण यथाक्रमम् ।

(Bḍ. I. 1.1.40 ab)

At each *pāda* the text underlines the moment where the next *pāda* follows in due order or the previous one was duly narrated as pre-announced. So at the end of the first *pāda* :

अनेनाद्येन पादेन पुराणं परिकीर्तितम् ॥

(Bḍ. I. 1.5.145 cd; cf. Vy I. 6.73 cd)

At the end of the second *pāda* :

इत्येष ह मया पादो द्वितीयः कथितो द्विजाः ।

विस्तरेणानुपूर्व्या च भूयः किं कथयाम्यहम् ॥

(Bḍ. I. 2.38.33; cf. Vy I. 61.186 cd)

The *śloka* is repeated with due changes in II. 3.74.278 (cf. Vy II. 37.458) at the end of the third *pāda*. The next *adhyāya* continues :

श्रुत्वा पादं तृतीयं तु कान्तं सूतेन धीमता ।

ततश्चतुर्थं पप्रच्छुः पादं वै ऋषिसत्तमाः ॥

(Bḍ. III. 4.1.1; cf. Vy II. 38.1)

These two purāṇa-s, then, are also fully aware of the order they have to follow in narrating their matter. Skanda purāṇa VII. 4.44.23, although speaking of '*purāṇānām anukramah*' refers apparently to the inner order of each purāṇa and so it can be quoted here to support our supposition that some purāṇic authors are always in

control of their own matter and put it in a prefixed order. The double *sūci-s* available at the beginning of some purāṇa-s¹⁴ show also that the purāṇas had a prefixed scheme to follow. In these cases indeed the interlocutors are introduced as they were already well acquainted with the matter to be narrated even before it is narrated.

3. Sequence of topics

Padma purāṇa I. 1, Matsya I, and several other purāṇa-s present a list of questions or topics to be dealt with in the purāṇa and specify that those subjects have to be narrated in order :

एतत्सर्वं महाभाग कथयस्व यथाक्रमम् ।

(Pd. I.1.17ef)

सर्वमेतत् समाचक्ष्व सूत विस्तरशः क्रमात् ।

(Mt. 1.7ab)

Being at the beginning of the purāṇa-s these *śloka-s* in fact express the intention of having the whole purāṇa narrated in due order, so their meaning is equivalent to what we said in the previous paragraph. At other times the order does not refer to the whole purāṇa but only to a group of subjects like in Nārada I.97.6d which speaks only of the order the first topics must have in the Nārada purāṇa itself; or in Brahmavaivarta purāṇa I.1.46-47 where also the reference is only to a few topics. In some other cases a subject is said to follow the previous one in due order as if the author knew what kind of link should join the two *kathā-s* or topics. Brahmavaivarta purāṇa I.22.32 states :

ब्रह्मणो बालकानाञ्च व्युत्पत्तिः कथिता मुने ।

साम्प्रतं नारदाख्यानं श्रूयताञ्च यथाक्रमम् ॥

The same purāṇa says : (II.4.14)

दुर्गायाश्चैव राधाया विस्तीर्णं चरितं महत् ।

तच्च पश्चात् प्रवक्ष्यामि संक्षेपं क्रमतः शृणु ॥

This last example shows already that the two '*carita-s*' form a kind of unit which is first narrated in a long form and then in short '*kramataḥ*'. In this way the distinction between *kathā-s* and the units, of which we spoke above, tends to disappear. So when the purāṇic authors speak of an inner order of a *kathā* (see Bḍ. I.1.1.35-

14. see, for instance, Brahmavaivarta purāṇa I. 1.

36; 2.48 ; Sk. II.8.108cd etc.) they may intend also something vaster than the narrow frames of the story.

All this tends to point out that the authors not only know of a scheme or sequence of topics for the whole purāṇa but are also aware of smaller units—sometimes identifiable *tout-court* with a *kathā*—, which also have their order.

4. Purāṇic origin

As is known the purāṇic authors have two theories about the origin of their works : one affirms that the 18 purāṇa-s were composed by Kṛṣṇa Dvaipāyana who reduced the ten million of purāṇic *śloka*-s to four hundred thousand and divided them into eighteen parts. This theory is available systematically only in Matsya 53, Skanda V. 1.2; VII. 3.1, Nārada I. 92 and Padma I. 1, but it is accepted as matter of fact by many more and it is the current doctrine even at present. The five passages mentioned above have a rather uniform text although there are signs of different schools and tendencies. From the point of view of our study this theory would favour one common scheme for all the purāṇa-s. Sentences like

पाठान्तरे पृथग्भूता वेदशाखा यथा तथा ॥

(Vy I. 61. 59 cd)

would support it. Or it would point out simply that the purāṇa-s have each their own distinct pattern and, at most, they are like different *adhyāya*-s of a unique enormous purāṇa. The theory of the three *gūṇa*-s examined above would confirm it.

The second theory is available only in four purāṇa-s, namely Brahmanḍa I. 2. 35.63ff. Vāyu I. 60.1ff, Viṣṇu III. 6.15ff, and Bhāgavata XII.7.5ff. It is not usually accepted nor is it even known. The four texts, reducible to three, as the Brahmanḍa and the Vāyu have exactly the same words, only casually correspond *verbatim*. The theory they propose, however, is rather uniform. As there are different vedic *śākhā*-s, says the theory, so there are also different purāṇic *śākhā*-s, which were formed in the following way. Kṛṣṇa Dvaipāyana taught his own *saṁhitā* to his disciple Sūta who, in his turn, transmitted it to his six disciples already good experts in the old matters (*purāṇeṣu* Bḍ. I.2.35-65ab). Among them three wrote their own *saṁhitā*-s and so from the one original *saṁhitā* four were formed. Vāyu I.60 seems to support the possibility that

from the very beginning Sūta transmitted the purāṇa *saṃhitā* in six different forms (षट्शः) and that three of them composed three other *saṃhitā*-s and then three more, so other six new *saṃhitā*-s were formed. According to the Vāyu purāṇa then we should think of the following stages in the purāṇic formation :

$$1 < 6 < 9 < 12$$

Such a detailed process is affirmed only by the Vāyu, which has variants from the Brahmāṇḍa on this point. But all the other three texts reporting this theory and the Vāyu itself immediately after it mention four *saṃhitā*-s only of which the names are also given. They are :

Lomaharṣaṇikā	—	the <i>mūlā saṃhitā</i>
Kāśyapikā	—	the <i>parā saṃhitā</i>
Sāvarnikā	—	<i>tṛtīya saṃhitā</i>
Śaṃśapāyanikā	—	<i>anyā</i>

Things are not so smooth indeed because the names of the four *saṃhitā*-s as well of the six disciples do not coincide in all the four purāṇa-s and, moreover, the Brahmāṇḍa has apparently another parallel theory which speaks of only five disciples of Sūta having names partially different from the six of the other texts.⁽¹⁵⁾ This uncertainty in the text as well as the fact that this theory is present only in some texts which are usually considered the oldest (except for the Bhāgavata which has here the shortest form with different names of the six disciples and puts it at the end of the purāṇa disregarding the parallelism with the Viṣṇu which it has in other places of the scheme) are points favouring an old tradition, most probably older than the other claiming the authorship of all the 18 purāṇa-s to Kṛṣṇa Dvaipāyana only. For our study we need not to have more or surer details; it is enough to know that the purāṇa-s not only were not all composed directly by Kṛṣṇa Dvaipāyana, but that they could be grouped according to their topic or tendency. In fact this theory, as we have seen, is parallel to the vedic *śākhā*-s under which it is inserted in our texts.

The Viṣṇu purāṇa (III. 6.19cd) claims to be a combination of the previous four *saṃhitā*-s :

चतुष्टयेन भेदेन संहितानामिदं मुने ॥

15. Brahmāṇḍa I. 1.1.12-15.

So some purāṇic authors were aware that the purāṇa-s were following common patterns and that such patterns could be transformed, as the Viṣṇu purāṇa does. The only text outside these ones referring to purāṇic composition and mentioning the names of these *saṃhitā*-s, is Bhaviṣya II. 1.1.4ab

पुराणसंहितां पुण्यां पप्रच्छू रौमहर्षणिम् ।

Other hints to divisions of the purāṇa-s like Vāyu II. 42.108f (नेकधा) or Devī Bhāgavata I. 1.13a (त्रिविधानि पुराणानि) may refer to the *guṇa* division we have seen above.

5. A Few Purāṇic Hints

We can perhaps go a step further. There is, first of all, a text which deserves more attention that I am now in a position to pay but that is rather meaningful for our research even at a first quick reading. The text, rather long, is Bhaviṣya III. 4.22.45-218. It presents the eighteen *mahākalpa*-s, of which it gives the names, the divinities, the Manus in charge and other details. But in five cases it mentions that the particular matter specified in that *mahākalpa* is known to a particular class of *paurāṇika*-s. These classes are *Brahmapaurāṇika*-s (śl. 48), *Viṣṇupaurāṇika*-s (śl. 98b, 99a), *Sivapaurāṇika*-s (śl. 102a), *Līṅgapaurāṇika*-s (śl. 129b) and *Bhāviṣyaka*-s (śl. 218b). It is not clear, in my present knowledge, what these words really mean. They apparently refer to different classes of specialists in purāṇic matters. We have to go slowly in our deductions because the text might be quite late, as it appears from the part of the purāṇa in which it is inserted. But if our supposition is correct, we can connect it with the division of the purāṇa-s according to the deities as it appears in Skanda VII. 1.289 and in Matsya 53.67-68 and deduce that there were people specialized in the old stories referring to a particular deity and purāṇa-s in which the main topic was one of the deities. We may perhaps even think that these *Brahmapaurāṇika*-s etc. went about narrating, like bards, their stories according to schemes or common patterns or sequence of topics. Just as any modern *Vyāsa*, while narrating the story of Rāma, although changing the details and the teachings *ad infinitum*, will follow always the same traditional pattern of the Rāmāyaṇa, so a *Brahmapaurāṇika* or a *Viṣṇupaurāṇika* ect., most probably, followed the same schemes in narrating their purāṇa-s.

Finally we have in our texts hints at matters taken from other purāṇa-s. Besides the examples of equal texts in two or more purāṇa-s, like Prayāgamāhātmya, etc.¹⁶ there are hints to the whole matter of a purāṇa or to portions of it renarrated by another one. For the whole matter of a purāṇa we have Padma V. 59.2 :

पुरा स्कन्दपुराणे च यन्मया कीर्तितं द्विजाः ।

कथयामि पुराणं च पुरतो मोक्षहेतवे ॥

For partial matter we have Bhaviṣya IV. 121.2, 4 :

भविष्यमत्स्यमार्तण्डपुराणेषु च वर्णितम् ।

वाराहं चैव संगृह्य कथ्यन्ते तानि पाण्डव ॥ 2 ॥

श्रुतिस्मृतिपुराणेभ्यो यन्मया ह्यवधारितम् ।

तत्ते वच्मि कुरुक्षेत्रे कन्यान्यस्योपदिश्यते ॥ 4 ॥

In a more general way Padma V. 36.14 ab says :

शृणुष्वऽदिपुराणेषु देवेभ्यश्च यथाश्रुति ।

These are most probably the only references to the process we are examining. We cannot deduce from them that the purāṇa-s show clear awareness of following schemes taken from other purāṇa-s, yet they show that some authors dared to say that they had taken their matter from other texts. The fact that the purāṇa-s know of Ādipurāṇa-s (Pd. V. 36.14 ab) or of other purāṇa-s (Bḍ. II. 63.174; Bhv. II. 1.21.1 ab; III. 4.21.131 ab; Pd. IV. 100.53 ab; VI. 63.55ab etc.) or that they quote single *śloka*-s from previous and old *itihāsa* texts (Bḍ. I. 5.4cd; II. 63.69ab; B. 15.49ab; Pd. VI. 29.1; Bhv. IV. 192.2ab etc.) does not prove that they know other purāṇic schemes or that they follow them. However, the constant references to other purāṇa-s show that the purāṇic authors are fully aware of what was going on in other texts and that sometimes they took inspiration from or copied them. The hint of Padma V. 59.2 mentioned above and the schemes of the Agni-Garuḍa (-Matsya), of the Brahmāṇḍa-Vāyu and Viṣṇu-Bhāgavata (and Brahma) are already good matter for a strong suspicion that there was a time when some purāṇa-s followed common schemes. The suggestion of Brahmāṇḍa-Vāyu and Viṣṇu-Bhāgavata that in the beginning the purāṇic literature contained only one and then four *saṃhitā*-s would point out that this phenomenon of the schemes took place very early and was very soon overcome by later development or increase in the number of purāṇa-s.

16. Matsya 102-112 and Padma, Svarga Khaṇḍa 39-49 (=Ādi Khaṇḍa 39-49).

TABLE I*

AGNI PURĀṆA
(ĀSS—11,457 *śl*)

GARUḌA PURĀṆA
(Jīv. Vidyās.—8,738 *śl.*)

UNIT I

- | | | | |
|------------------|-----------|------------------|---------|
| 1. Maṅgalācaraṇa | a. 1 | 1. Maṅgalācaraṇa | a. 1 |
| 2. Avatāra-s | aa. 2-16 | 2. Avatāra-s | a. 1 |
| | | —Anukramaṇikā | a. 2 |
| 3. Jagatsarga | aa. 17-20 | 3. Sṛṣṭi | aa. 3-6 |
| —Vamśa | aa. 18-19 | | |

UNIT II

- | | |
|--|---------------------------|
| 4. Karmakāṇḍa aa. 21-37 | 4. Karmakāṇḍa aa. 7-45 |
| 5. Buildings.... | 5. Buildings.... |
| devatāsthāpana aa. 38-71 | devatāsthāpana aa. 46-48 |
| <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">karmakāṇḍa aa. 71-91
buildings....
devatāsthāpana aa. 92-106</div> | —yoga a. 49 |
| — | 6. Dharmaśāstra aa. 50-52 |
| | —aṣṭanidhi a. 53 |

UNIT III

- | | |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 6. Tīrthamāhātmya aa. 109-117 | — |
| (Gayā, śrāddha) | |
| 7. Bhuvanakośa aa. 108, 118-120 | 7. Bhuvanakośa aa. 54-57 |
| | —vamśa a. 54 |
| | —Sūryavyūha a. 55 |
| 8. Jyotiṣa aa. 121-149 | 8. Jyotiṣa aa. 59-80 |
| (with many related subjects) | —narastrīlakṣaṇa aa. 63-65 |
| — | 9. Tīrthamāhātmya aa. 81-90 |
| | (Gayā-Pitrākhyāna) |
| 9. Manvantara a. 150 | 10. Manvantara a. 87 |
| | —ādhyātmika aa. 91-92 |

* All the divisions and groupings of subjects as well as the names given to the topics in this and in the following tables have been prepared for this study. They do not appear in the purāṇa-s, although they are based on them.

UNIT IV

10. Dharmaśāstra	aa. 151-217	11. Dharmaśāstra	aa. 93-107
11. Rājadharmā etc.	aa. 218-248	12. Nītiśāstra	aa. 108-115
-dhanurveda	aa. 249-252		

UNIT V

12. Veda-s (and Purāṇa-Itihāsa)	—		
	aa. 259-272		
13. Karmakāṇḍa	aa. 263-270	13. Karmakāṇḍa and Vrata	aa. 116-137
14. Varṇa	aa. 173-178	14. Varṇa	aa. 138-142
—		15. Rāmāyaṇa-Mahābhārata	aa. 143-145

UNIT VI

15. Āyurveda	aa. 279-298	16. Āyurveda	aa. 146-194
16. Aśvavāyana	a. 288	—	
17. Mantra (and pūjās)	aa. 299-317	17. Mantra-s (karmakāṇḍa, vidyā, cudāmaṇi	aa. 195-199
18. Karmakāṇḍa	aa. 318-327	—	
—		18. Vāyujaya, Aśvāyurveda	aa. 200-201
19. Chanda-s, kāvya, alamkāra, vyākaraṇa, amarkośa	aa. 328-367	19. Vyākaraṇa —sadācāra	aa. 203-204 aa. 205
—		20. Karmakāṇḍa	aa. 206-212
—		21. Dharmaśāstra	aa. 213-215

UNIT VII

20. Pralaya	aa. 368-369	22. Pralaya	aa. 216-217
—limbs of the body	a. 370		
21. Naraka-s	a. 371	—	
22. Yoga	aa. 372-376	23. Yoga	a. 218
—		24. Ādhyātmika	aa. 219-226
23. Brahmajñāna	aa. 377-380	25. Brahmajñāna —Ātmajñāna	a. 227 a. 228 a. 229
24. Gītāsārā	a. 381	26. Gītāsārā	
—Yamagītā	a. 382	—	
25. Agnipurāṇamahātmya	a. 383		

UTTARAKHANḌA (Pratikalpa)

TABLE II

MATSYA PURĀṆA
(ĀSS-14,062 f1)

AGNI PURĀṆA
(ĀSS-11,457 f1)

GARUḌA PURĀṆA
(Jīv. 8,738 f1)

UNIT I

- | | | |
|--------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|
| 1. Maṅgalāc. a. 1 | 1. Maṅgalāc. a. 1 | 1. Maṅgalāc. a. 1 |
| 2. Matsyāvatāra. aa. 2-3 | 2. Avatāras aa. 2-16 | 2. Avatāras a.1
—anukram. a. 2 |
| 3. Sṛṣṭi aa. 4-8 | 3. Jagatsarga aa. 17-20
—varṇśa aa. 18-19 | 3. Sṛṣṭi aa. 3-6 |

Manvantara a. 9
Prthivīdohana a.10

UNIT II

UNIT V

- | | | |
|---------------------|--|-----------------------------------|
| 4. Varṇśa aa. 11-51 | 12. Vedas (Purāṇa-
itihāsa) aa. 259-272 | — |
| 5. Kriyāyoga a. 52 | 13. Karmak. aa. 263-270 | 13. Karmak. -vrata
aa. 116-137 |
| — | — | 15. Rām. -Mbh.
aa. 143-145 |

Dharmaśāstra aa. 54-101

UNIT III

- | | | |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|---|
| 7. Tīrtham. aa. 102-112 | 6. Tīrtham. aa. 109-117 | — |
| 8. Bhuvanak. aa. 112-
123 | 7. Bhuvanak. aa. 108,
118-120 | 7. Bhuvanak. aa.
54-57 |
| 9. Jyotiṣa aa. 124-140 | 8. Jyotiṣa aa. 121-149 | 8. Jyotiṣa aa.59-80
—nara-stri 63-65 |
| — | — | 9. Tīrtham. 81-90 |
| 10. Caturyuga-Manv.
141-159 | 9. Manvantara a. 150 | 10. Manv. a. 87 |
| —ādhyāt. aa. 160-162 | — | —ādhyāt. aa. 91-92 |

sṛṣṭi (pralaya) aa. 163-165
yajñāvatāra a. 166
sṛṣṭi aa. 167-175
—ādhyātm. a. 176

Tīrtham. aa. 179-193

Varṇśa aa. 194-203

UNIT IV.

11. Dharmaśāstra aa. 204-213	10. Dharmaśāstra aa. 151-217	11. Dharmaśāstra aa. 93-107
12. Rājadharmā aa. 214-226	11. Rājadharmā aa. 218-248 —Dhanurv. aa. 249-252	12. Nītiśāstra aa. 108-115
13. Dharmaśāstra aa. 227-242	—	—

Avatāra aa. 243-247
Kṣīrodamanthana
(sr̥ṣṭi) aa. 248-250

UNIT V

—
14. Buildings-Devatāp. aa. 251-269 —Kriyāyoga a. 257
15. Vamśa aa. 270-272
16. Dharmaśāstra (dāna) aa. 273-288
17. Kalpas a. 289
18. Matsyasūci a. 290

UNIT II

4. Karmakāṇḍa aa. 21-37	4. Karmakāṇḍa aa. 7-45
5. Buildings-Devatāp. aa. 38-106 —	5. Buildings-Deva- tāp. aa. 46-48 —Yoga a. 49 —
—	6. Dharmaśāstra aa. 50-52 —aṣṭanidhi a. 93
—	—
—	—

Units VI and VII

VIṢṆU PURĀṆA
(Jīv. Vidyās.-6, 373)

TABLE III

BHĀGAVATA PURĀṆA
(Jīv. Vidyās.-14, 579)

SECTION I

1. Introduction a. I. 1

2. Utpatti aa. I. 2-9

—Varṇsa a. I. 7

—Samudra manthana a. I. 9

3. Varṇsa aa. I. 10-II. 1

—Jagat-vyavasthā a. I. 22

4. Bhuvanakośa aa. II. 2-12

—Varṇsa aa. II. 13-16

1. Introduction aa. I. 1-19

—Bhagavad-avatāra a. I. 3

—Vyāsa

2. Sṛṣṭi aa. II. 1-7

—Bhagavad-upadeśa aa. II.
8-9

Introduction a. II. 10

—Vidura-Uddhava-Maitreya
aa. III. 1-4

Sṛṣṭi aa. III. 9-13

—Manvantara-Kālavibhāga
a. III. 11

3. Varṇsa aa. III. 14-25

—Brahmā sṛṣṭi a. III. 20

—Tattva utpatti a. III. 26

4. Ādhyātmika aa. III. 27-33

—Varṇsa aa. IV. 1-V. 15

5. Bhuvanakośa aa. V. 16-26

SECTION II

5. Manvantara aa. III. 1-3

Vyāsas—of the past a. III. 1

—of the future a. III. 2

6. Vedas aa. III. 4-6

7. Yamagītā a. III. 7

8. Dharmaśāstra aa. III. 8-16

9. Sāmpradayikī kathā
aa. III. 8. 16

6. Yamadūta Ajāmila aa. VI. 1-3

7. Varṇsa aa. VI. 4-VII. 10

—puṁsavanavratā a. VI. 19

8. Dharmaśāstra aa. VI. 11-15

9. Manvantara

—of the past a. VIII. 1

10. Sāmpradayikā kathā aa.

VIII. 2-5

—sṛṣṭi (samudramanthana)
aa. VIII 6-12

—of the future aa. VIII. 13-14

11. Avatāra aa. VIII. 15-23

SECTION III

- | | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| 10. Vamśa aa. IV. 1-23 | 12. Vamśa aa. IX. 1-24 |
| 11. Kṛṣṇa avatāra aa. V. 1-38 | 13. Kṛṣṇa avatāra aa. X. 1-XI. 6,
30-31
—ādhyātmika aa. 7-16
—dharmaśāstra aa. 17-18. |
| 12. Kaliyugadharma aa. VI. 1-2 | 14. Kaliyuga aa. XII. 1-3 |
| 13. Pralaya aa. VI. 3-4 | 15. Pralaya a. XII. 4 |
| 14. Ādhyātmika aa. VI. 5-7 | — |
| 15. Conclusion a. VI. 8 | 16. Conclusion : antima upadeśa
a. XII. 5 |
-
- | |
|--|
| 17. Vedas aa. XII. 6-7 |
| 18. Mārkaṇḍeya aa. 8-10 |
| 19. Bhagavad aṅga-upāṅga
a. XII. 11 |
| 20. Sūci aa. XII. 12-13 |

TABLE IV

BRAHMĀNḌA PURĀṆA

VĀYU PURĀṆA

UNIT I

I. Prakriyā pāda

1. Anukramaṇikā-Introduction aa. I. 1-2
2. Sṛṣṭi aa. I. 3-8

1. Anukramaṇikā-Introduction aa. I. 1-2
2. Sṛṣṭi aa. I. 3-9

II. Anuṣaṅga pāda

- pratisandhi a. I. 6
- dharmaśāstra a. I. 7

- pratisarga a. I. 7
- dharmaśāstra a. I. 8

UNIT II

3. Manvantara a. I. 9

Mahādevatanu a. I. 10

3. Manvantara a. I. 10

- a. ādhyātmika aa. I. 11-15
- b. dharmaśāstra aa. I. 16-18
- c. ādhyātmika aa. I. 19-20
- d. kalpa aa. I. 21-22
- e. avatāra aa. I. 23-24
- f. utpatti aa. I. 25-27

4. Vamśa aa. I. 11-14

5. Bhuvanakośa aa. I. 15-24

4. Vamśa aa. I. 28-33

—yugadharma a. I. 32

5. Bhuvanakośa aa. I. 34-53

—Gaṅgā avatāra a. I. 47

UNIT III

6. Karmakāṇḍa aa. I. 25-33

—yuga a. I. 29, 31

7. Veda-purāṇas a. I. 34

8. Vamśa aa. I. 35-II. 8

—Pṛthivīdohana a. 136

6. Karmakāṇḍa aa. I. 54-59

—caturyuga a. I. 58

7. Veda-purāṇas a. I. 60

8. Vamśa aa. I. 61-II. 9

—Pṛthivīdohana a. II. 1

III. Upodghāta pāda

—Sarga aa. I. 38; II. 3-7

9. Dharmaśāstra aa. II. 9-20

—Sarga aa. II. 2.; 5-8

9. Dharmaśāstra aa. II. 9-20

UNIT IV

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 10. Varṇśa aa. II. 21-74 | 10. Varṇśa aa. II. 22-37 |
| —Arjuna aa. II. 21-29 | —Vaivasvata sṛṣṭi a. II. 23 |
| —Bhārgava aa. II. 25-46 | —Gītālakāra aa. II. 24-25 |
| —Sagara aa. II. 44-58, 63 | —Śambhu a. II. 35 |
| —Vaivasvata-utpatti
aa. II. 59-60 | |
| —Gandharva aa. II. 61-62 | |
| —Viṣṇumāhātmya
aa. II. 72-73 | —Viṣṇumāhātmya aa. II. 36 |

IV. Upasamhāra

- | | |
|--|----------------------------|
| 11. Manvantara a. III. | 11. Manvantara a. II. 38 |
| 12. Bhuvanakośa a. III. 2 | 12. Bhuvanakośa a. II. 39 |
| 13. Pratisarga-pralaya
aa. III. 3-4 | 13. Pralaya aa. II. 40-41 |
| 14. Conclusion a. III. 4 | 14. Conclusion a. II. 42 |
| Lalitā-upākhyāna
aa. III. 5-40. | Gayāmāhātmya aa. II. 43-50 |

TABLE V

VIṢṆU PURĀṆA

1. Introduction a. I. 1
2. Utpatti aa. 2-9
3. Vamśa aa. I. 10-II.1
4. Bhuvanakośa (Vamśa) aa. II. 2-16
5. Manvantara aa. III. 1-3
-
6. Vedas aa. III. 4-6
7. Yamagītā aa. III. 7
8. Dharmaśāstra aa. III. 8-16
9. Sāmpradāyikī kathā aa. III. 17-18
10. Vamśa aa. IV. 1-23
-
10. Kṛṣṇavatāra aa. V. 1-38
11. Kaliyugadharma aa. VI. 1-2
12. Pralaya aa. VI. 3-4
13. Ādhyātmika aa. VI. 5-7
14. Conclusion a. VI. 8

BRAHMĀṆḌA PURĀṆA

1. Introduction aa. I. 1-2
2. Sṛṣṭi aa. I. 3-8
3. Manvantara aa. I. 9-10
4. Vamśa aa. I. 11-14
5. Bhuvanakośa aa. I. 15-24
6. Karmakāṇḍa aa. I. 25-33
7. Vedas-purāṇas a. I. 34
8. Vamśa aa. I. 35-II.8
9. Dharmaśāstra aa. II. 9-20
-
10. Vamśa aa. II. 21-74
11. Manvantara aa. III. 1
12. Bhuvanakośa a. III. 2
13. Pratisarga (pralaya) aa. III. 3-4
-
14. Conclusion a. III. 4
- Lalitā-upākhyāna aa. III. 5-40

TABLE VI

BRAHMA PURĀṆA	BRAHMĀṆḌA (Viṣṇu) PURĀṆA
1. Maṅgalācaraṇa a. 1	1. Introduction aa. I. 1-2
2. Ādisarga aa. 1-4	2. Sṛṣṭi aa. I. 3-8
—vaṁśa a. 2	
3. Manvantara a. 5	3. Manvantara aa. I. 9-10
—utpatti a. 6	
4. Vaṁśa aa. 7-17	4. Vaṁśa aa. I. 11-14
5. Bhuvanakośa aa. 18-27	5. Bhuvanakośa aa. I. 15-24
6. Tīrthamāhātmya aa. 28-57	
—karmakāṇḍa māhātmya	
aa. 57-59	
—dharmaśāstra aa. 60-67	
—Viṣṇuloka varṇana a. 68	
7. Tīrthamāhātmya aa. 69-178	
	(Viṣṇu Purāṇa)
8. Kṛṣṇāvatāra (and other	10. Kṛṣṇāvatāra aa. V. 1-38
avatāras aa. 179-213	
	AGNI PURĀṆA (Garuḍa)
9. Naraka aa. 214-216	20. Pralaya aa. 368-370
—Dharmaśāstra aa. 216-225	—limbs of body
—Karmakāṇḍa aa. 226-228	
10. Pralaya aa. 229-233	21. Narakas a. 371
11. Yoga aa. 234-242	22. Yoga aa. 372-376
12. Jñāna aa. 243-244	23. Brahmajñāna aa. 377-380
13. Conclusion a. 245	

TABLE VII

List of Kūrma I. 1; Padma VI. 219; Śiva VII. 1.1.43	Acc. to Garuḍa	Acc. to Padma	Acc. to Bhaviṣya
1. Brahma	T	R	S
2. Padma	R	S	S
3. Viṣṇu	S	S	S
4. Śiva (Vāyu)	S	T	{ R (R)
5. Bhāgavata	S	S	{ S
6. Bhaviṣya	R	R	
7. Nāradya	T	S	T
8. Mārkaṇḍeya	T	R	T
9. Agni	R	T	T
10. Brahmavaivarta	T	R	—
11. Liṅga	T	T	{ T
12. Varāha	R	S	{ T
13. Skanda	R	T	S
14. Vāmana	R	R	R
15. Kūrma	S	T	R
16. Matsya	S	T	R
17. Garuḍa	S	S	{ S
18. Brahmāṇḍa	T	R	{ T
Nṛsiṃha	—	—	R

List of Liṅga I. 39 Śiva V. 44.120.	Acc. to Garuḍa	Acc. to Padma	Acc. to Bhaviṣya
1. Brahma	T	R	S
2. Padma	R	S	S
3. Viṣṇu	S	S	S
4. Śiva (Vāyu)	S	T	R (R)
5. Bhāgavata	S	S	S
6. Bhaviṣya	R	R	T
7. Nāradya	T	S	—
8. Mārkaṇḍeya	T	R	T
9. Agni	R	T	T
10. Brahmavaivarta	T	R	—
11. Liṅga	T	T	T
12. Varāha	R	S	T
13. Vāmana	R	R	R
14. Kūrma	S	T	R
15. Matsya	S	T	R
16. Garuḍa	S	S	S
17. Skanda	R	T	S
18. Brahmāṇḍa	T	R	T
Nṛsiṃha	—	—	R

List of Padma VI. 263	Acc. to Garuḍa	Acc. to Padma	Acc. to Bhaviṣya
1. Brahma	[T	R	S
2. Padma	[R }	S	S
3. Viṣṇu	{ S	S	S
4. Śiva (Vāyu)	{ S }	T	R (R)
5. Bhāgavata	{ S }	S	S
6. Nāradya	[T	S	—
7. Mārkaṇḍeya	[T	R	T
8. Agni	[R	T	T
9. Bhaviṣya	[R }	R	T
10. Brahmavaivarta	[T	R	—
11. Liṅga	[T	T	T
12. Varāha	[R	S	T
13. Vāmana	[R }	R	R
14. Kūrma	{ S }	T	R
15. Matsya	{ S }	S	S
16. Garuḍa	{ S }		
17. Skanda	[R	[T	S
18. Brahmāṇḍa	[T	[R	T
Nṛsimha	—	—	R

Note : S=Sāttvika; R=Rājasa; T=Tāmasa. The order of the *guṇa*-s as given in Garuḍa fits well also the list of the purāṇa-s in Padma IV. 111, while the order of the Bhaviṣya fits also the list of Bhaviṣya III. 3.28. For further clarifications see above p. 168-170.

IS KAPILA, THE FOUNDER OF THE SĀMKNHYA SYSTEM,
IDENTICAL WITH THE DESTROYER OF THE SONS OF
THE KING SAGARA ?

by

RAM SHANKAR BHATTACHARYA

[अशिष्टान् सगरनृपपुत्रान् कपिलो नाम मुनिः स्वतेजसा ददाहेति पौराणिकी प्रसिद्धिः । कपिलोऽयं सांख्यप्रवक्तेति भागवते, देवीभागवते चोक्तम् । पुराणद्वयोक्तं मतमिदं पुराणवाङ्मयमतानुसारेणैव न संगतं भवति; सांख्यवक्तुः कपिलाद् भिन्नोऽयं कपिल इति च मते लेखकेनात्र प्रतिपादिते । निबन्धलेखकेन अभिहितं यद् भागवत-देवीभागवते एव सगरपुत्रनाशकं सांख्यवक्तारं मन्येते, नान्यत् पुराणमुपपुराणमितिहासो वा, अतो मतमिदं न श्रद्धातुं शक्यते । ध्वंसकृत्-कपिल-संबद्धानि देश-काल-पित्रादि-गुण-कर्मादीनि न सांख्यवक्तरि कपिले संगतानि भवन्ति—इति लेखकेन विस्तरेण प्रदर्शितम् ।

यतो ध्वंसकृत् कपिलो विष्णु-वासुदेव-रूपेण प्रसिद्धि गतः, सांख्यवक्ता कपिलोऽपि विष्णोस्वताररूपेण संमानितो वैष्णवैरर्वाक्कालिकैः, अतो ध्वंसकृत् कपिल एव सांख्यवक्ता कपिल इति प्रसिद्धिर्जाता, या वैष्णवसंप्रदाय-विशेषालम्बिना भागवतकारेणानुसृता । द्वयोर्मुन्योः कपिलेतिपदाभिधेयत्वपि अस्याः प्रसिद्धेः (वस्तुतः भ्रान्तदृष्टेः) हेतुः ।

कपिलद्वयैक्यविषयकमिदं भ्रान्तं मतम् आदौ अवशिष्टदशिना भागवत-कारेण प्रोक्तम्, सतश्च देवीभागवतकारेणानुसृतम् । सांख्यवक्तुर्भिन्नः कपिलः ('वक्रवर्ण'—'वासुदेवा'परनामा) संकल्पबलेन बल्लिमुत्पाद्य सगरपुत्रान् ददाह—इति प्राचीनपुराणेष्वपि विज्ञायापि भागवतकारः स्वेच्छया ध्वंसकृतं कपिलं सांख्यवक्तारं मेने—इत्यपि भवितुं मर्हति इति लेखको वक्ति । आदिविदुषा सिद्धेश्वरेण परमविना सहजातधर्मज्ञानवैराग्यैश्वर्येण कपिलेन सगरपुत्रदहनरूपं कर्म कृतमिति कथन मध्यात्मशास्त्रदृष्ट्या च संगतं भवतीति लेखकीया दृष्टिः ।

निबन्धान्ते सांख्यवक्तु-कपिल-कालविषये काचिद् दुःसमाधेया समस्या उपपन्न्यस्ता लेखकेन ।]

The Bhāgavata, after stating the burning of the sons of the king Sagara by a sage named Kapila in 9.8.10-12, remarks in the following two verses (13-14)¹ that this Kapila is the same as the founder of Sāṃkhya. These two verses suggest that it is not the wrath of the sage that burnt the sons of Sagara to ashes; in fact it is their sinful acts that caused their death. The Devī-Bhāgavata (6.15.42),² while giving incidentally examples of the ill-results of lust, wrath, greed and egoism, categorically states that the sons of Sagara were burnt by the Sāṃkhya teacher Kapila on account of *daivayoga* (the power of destiny).

This incident of burning was so widely known that a poet like Bhavabhūti has clearly referred to it in his Uttararāmacarita (1.23).³ Though Kālidāsa in his Raghuvamśa⁴ (13.3) spoke of the digging of the earth by the sons of Sagara with a view to finding out the sacrificial horse and the carrying away of the horse by Kapila to the nether region and was silent on the incident of the burning of the sons of Sagara by the fire created by the wrath of Kapila, yet we have no doubt that he was aware of this incident.

A careful study of the relevant Purāṇic passages would reveal that the philosopher (i. e. founder of Sāṃkhya) Kapila was not the destroyer of the sons of Sagara. We shall also try to show the causes that gave rise to this wrong identification.

(A) The episode of the burning of the wicked sons of the king Sagara by the wrathful sage Kapila is set out in the following

1. न साधुवादो मुनिकोपभजिता नृपेन्द्रेषुत्रा इति सत्त्वधामनि ।
कथं तमो रोषमयं विभाव्यते जगत्-पवित्रात्मनि खे रजो भुवः ॥
यस्येरिता सांख्यमयी दृढेह नीर्यया मुमुक्षुस्तरते दुरत्ययम् ।
भवार्णवं मृत्युपथं विपश्चिदः परात्मभूतस्य कथं पृथङ्मतिः ॥
2. कपिलः सांख्यवेत्ता च योगाम्नासरतः शुचिः ।
तेनापि दैवयोगाद्धि प्रदग्धाः सगरात्मजाः ॥
3. तुरगविचयव्यग्रानुर्वीभिदः सगराध्वरे कपिलमहसामर्षि प्लुष्टान् पितृष्व
पितामहान् । (v. 1. पितुः प्रपितामहान्) ।
4. गुरोयियक्षोः कपिलेन मेघ्ये रसातलं संक्रमिते तुरङ्गे ।
तदर्थमुर्वीमवदारदभिः पूर्वेः किलायं परिवर्तितो नः ॥

Purāṇic works and the epics⁵ :

Vāyu-p. 88. 147-148; Brahmāṇḍa-p. 2.53.25-35 and 2.63.146; Viṣṇu-p. 4.4.11, 23 (in prose); Brahma-p. 8.52-56; Matsy. 12.42b-43a (The destroyer is called Viṣṇu; there is no separate mention of the name Kapila); Padma-p. 5.8.147; 6.21.37b-38; Liṅga-p. 1.66.18; the printed reading विष्णुहंकारमार्गणैः is to be corrected to विष्णुना येश्वरमार्गणैः; Agni-p. 273.28a-29a; Nāradya-p. 1.18.109; Viṣṇudharmottara-p. 1.18.14-16a; Śiva-p. 5.38.51-53; N. śimha-p. 26.7; Br. Dharma-p. 2.18:28-29 and 2.22.41; Br. Nāradya. 89.99-113; Rāmāyaṇa 1.40.24-30; Mahābhārata, Vana-p. 47.18 and 107.28-33; Udyoga-p. 109.17b-18a; Anuśāsana-p. 153.9 ; Harivaṁśa 1.14.24-25.⁶

5. Though Harivaṁśa (1.15.7) and Brahma-p. (8.68) inform us that 'the śruti says that the king Sagara had 1 wives' yet no Vedic text is found to contain any information about this king or his sons. This is why Vedic text is of any help to us in determining the identity of the destroyer Kapila. It is quite reasonable to think that the word śruti in the aforesaid Purāṇic passage simply means 'tradition' (*aitihya*).
6. स तं देशं सुतैः सर्वैः खानयामास पार्थिवः । आसेदुश्च ततस्तस्मिन्स्तद्वन् महार्णवे ॥ तमादिपुरुषं देवं हरिं कृष्णं प्रजापतिम् ॥ विष्णुं कपिलरूपेण नारायणं प्रभुम् ॥ तस्य चक्षुः समासाद्य तेजस्तत् प्रतिपद्यते । दग्धाः पुत्रास्तदा सर्वे चत्वारस्त्ववशेषिताः ॥ (Vāyu-p. 88.146-148). ततो मुनिरदीना ध्यानमङ्गप्रवर्षितः ॥२५॥ क्रोधेन महताविष्टश्चक्षुर्भेदं कपिलस्तदा । प्रचक्षुः दूरावर्षीं वषितस्तैर्दुर्वात्मभिः ॥२६॥....उन्मीलयत् तदानेत्रे वह्निं क्रसमद्युतिं तदाक्षिणीं कर्णं राजन् राजेतां सुभृशारुणे ॥२९॥...अवैक्षत स गम्भीरः कृता कालपर्यये । क्रुद्धस्य तस्य नेत्राभ्यां सहसा पावकाचिषः ॥३०॥ क्रोधाग्निं स महाराज ज्वालाव्याप्तदिगन्तरः ॥३०॥ दग्धाश्चकार तान् सर्वान् आवृण्वन् नभस्तलम् ॥३५॥ (Brahmāṇḍa-p. 2.53.25-35). स तु देशं सुतैः सर्वैः खानयामास पार्थिवः । आसेदुश्च ततस्तस्मिन् स्वनन्तस्ते महार्णवे ॥१॥ तमादिपुरुषं देवं हरिं कृष्णं प्रजापतिम् । विष्णुं कपिलरूपेण हंसं नारायणं प्रभुम् ॥१४५॥ तस्य चक्षुः समासाद्य तेजस्तत् प्रतिपद्यते । दग्धाः पुत्रास्तदा सर्वे चत्वारस्त्ववशेषिताः ॥ (Brahmāṇḍa-p. 2.63.144-146). ततश्च तेनाभगवता किञ्चिदधीषत् परिवर्तितेन लोचनेन विलोकिताः स्वशरीरसमुत्थेन अग्निं ब्रह्ममाणा विनेशुः (Viṣṇu-p. 4.4.11). ततस्तत्-पुत्र-बलमशेषं परमणिं कपिलेन तेजसा दग्धम् (*ibid* 4.4.12). स तं देशं तदा पुत्रैः खानयामास पार्थिवः । आसेदुस्तु तदा तत्र स्वन्यमाने महार्णवे ॥५४॥ तमादिपुरुषं देवं ह

कृष्णं प्रजापतिम् । विष्णुं कपिलरूपेण स्वपन्तं पुरुषं तदा ॥५५ तस्य चक्षुः-
समुत्थेन तेजसा प्रतिबुध्यतः । दग्धाः सर्वे मुनिश्रेष्ठाश्चत्वारस्त्ववशेषिताः ॥
५६ (Brahma-p. 8.54-56). ततः षष्टिसहस्राणि सुषुवे यादवी प्रभा ॥४२
खनन्तः पृथिवीं दग्धा विष्णुना येऽश्वमार्गणे (Matsya-p. 12.42b-43a).
ततः षष्टिसहस्राणि सुषुवे यादवी प्रभा । खनन्तः पृथिवीं दग्धा
विष्णुना येऽश्वमार्गणे ॥ (Padma-p. 5.8.147). तत्रैकमादिपुरुषं
ददृशुस्ते त्वरान्विताः ॥ ३७। चोरोऽयमवदंस्वेति कपिलं जगतां प्रभुम् ।
तस्य चक्षुःसमुत्थेन वह्निना प्रतिबुध्यतः ॥३८। दग्धाः षष्टिसहस्राणि
चत्वारस्तेऽवशेषिताः ॥ ३९क (Padma-p. 6.21.37b-39a). ततः षष्टि-
सहस्राणि सुषुवे यादवी प्रभा । खनन्तः पृथिवीं दग्धाः विष्णुहुंकारमार्गणैः ।
(Linga-p. 1.66.18). प्रभा षष्टिसहस्राणां सुतानां जननी त्वभूत् ॥२८।
खनन्तः पृथिवीं दग्धाः कपिलेनाथ सागराः (Agni- p. 273.28a-29a).
तत्रापश्यन् महात्मानं कोटिसूर्यसमप्रभम् । कपिलं ध्याननिरतं वाजिनं च
तदन्तिके ॥९५। ततः सर्वे ते संरब्धास्तं मुनिं पश्य वेगतः । हन्तुं मुदयुक्त-
मनसो विद्वन्तः समासदन् ॥९९ [एतन्तरं 'दुःशीलतानिन्दापरका बहवः
श्लोकाः कपिलेनोक्ताः] इत्युक्त्वा कपिलः क्रुद्धो नेत्राभ्यां ससृजेऽनलम् ।
स वह्निः सागरान् सर्वान् भस्मसाद् अकरोत् क्षणात् ॥ Nāradya--p.
1.18.95-109). कपिलस्य समीपस्थं ददृशुस्ते तुरङ्गमम् । तुरङ्गसहितं
दृष्ट्वा कपिलं ते त्वमषिताः ॥१४। कुद्दाललेपिकाहस्तास्तस्य जग्मुर्वधेप्सया ।
तान् बाधमानान् दुर्बुद्धीन् संददर्श तदा ऋषिः ॥१५। चक्षुषा दृष्टमात्रास्ते
भस्मीभूतास्तु सागराः । (Viṣṇudharmottara-p. 1. 18. 14-16a).
महाराजोऽथ सगरस्तद्दह्यान्वेषणाय च । स तं देशं तदा पुत्रीः खानयामास
सर्वतः ॥ आसेदुस्ते ततस्तत्र खन्यमाने महार्णवे ॥ तमादिपुरुषं देवं कपिलं
विश्वरूपिणम् ॥ तस्य चक्षुःसमुत्थेन वह्निना प्रतिबुध्यतः । दग्धाः षष्टि-
सहस्राणि चत्वारस्त्ववशेषिताः ॥ (Śiva-p. 5.38 51-53). अस्थिशर्करा-
भूताः कपिलमहर्षिनिर्दग्धाश्च गुरवः सागराख्या ण्डगातोयसंस्पृष्टा दिवमा-
रोपिताः (Narasimha-p. 26.7). ततो भग्नसमाविश्र कपिलो नाम वै
मुनिः । उन्निद्रयित्वा नयने तान् ददर्श स तामसान् । हुंकारशब्दसंयुक्त-
चक्षुर्दर्शनतो मुनिः । तत्क्षणादेव वै भस्म चकार तान् कृतागसः ॥
(Brhaddharma-p. 2.18.28-29). तत्रापश्यन् महात्मानं कोटिसूर्य-
समप्रभम् । कपिलं ध्याननिरतं सति चैव तदन्तिके ॥९९। प्रमत्ताः पाप-
निरताः सागरा अबिवेकिनः । सर्वे ते सहसा ह्येते मुनिं बन्धुं समुद्यताः ॥१००।
हन्यतां हन्यतामेव वध्यतां वध्यतामिति ॥१०१।...परित्यक्तसमाभिस्तु
तान् दृष्ट्वा विस्मितो मुनिः । उवाच भावगम्भीरं लोकोपद्रवकारिणः ॥१०५।

The burning incident has not been mentioned by the Garuḍa-p. (1.138.29), the Kūrma-p. (1.21.5-7) and the Saura-p. (30.98) though they speak of the king Sagara, his wives and his descendants.

इत्युक्त्वा कपिलः क्रुद्धो नेत्रादग्निं विसृष्टवान् । स बह्निः सागरान् सर्वान्
भस्मसादकरोत् तदा । (Bṛhannāradya 8.96.99-113). ते तु सर्वे
महात्मानः भीमवेगा महाबलाः ॥२४॥ ददृशुः कपिलं तत्र वासुदेवं सनातनम् ।
२५क। श्रुत्वा तु वचनं तेषां कपिलो रघुनन्दन । रोषेण महताविष्टो हुंकार
मकरोत् तदा ॥२९॥ ततस्तेनाप्रमेयेण कपिलेन महात्मना । भस्मराषीकृताः
सर्वे काकुत्स्थ सगरात्मजाः ॥३०॥ (Rāmāyaṇa 1.40.24-30). योऽसौ
भूमिगतः श्रीमान् विष्णुर्मधुनिसूदनः । कपिलो नाम देवोऽसौ भगवानजितो
हरिः ॥१८॥ येन पूर्वं महात्मानः खनमाना रसातलम् । दर्शनादेव निहताः
सगरस्यात्मजा विभो ॥१९॥ (Mbh. Vana-p. 47.18-19). अपश्यन्त
ह्यं तत्र विवरन्तं महीतले । विदार्य पातालमथ संक्रुद्धाः सगरात्मजाः ॥२८
....ते तं दृष्ट्वा ह्यं राजन् संप्रहृष्टतनूद्गहाः । अनादृत्य महात्मानं कपिलं
कालचोदिताः । संक्रुद्धा संप्रधावन्त अश्वग्रहणकाङ्क्षिणः । ततः क्रुद्धो
महाराज कपिलो मुनिसत्तमः ॥३१॥ वासुदेवेति यं प्राहुः कपिलं मुनिपुङ्गवम् ।
स चक्षुर्विकृतं कृत्वा तेजस्तेषु समुत्सृजत् ॥३२॥ ददाह सुमहातेजा मन्दबुद्धीन्
स सागरान् ॥३३॥ (Mbh. Vana-p. 107.28-33). अत्र चक्रधनुर्नाम
सूर्याज् जातो महानृषिः । विदुर्य कपिलं देवं येनातीः सगरात्मजाः ॥
(Udyoga-p. 109.17b-18a). महतश्चूर्णितान् पश्य ये हासन्त महो-
दधिम् । सुवर्णधारिणा नित्यमवशाता द्विजातिना ॥ (Mbh. Anuśāsana-
p. 153.9) : “महतः सगरपुत्रान् आसन्त उपासन्त, सुवर्णधारिणा शोभन्तो
ब्राह्मणवर्णस्तस्य धारिणा धर्त्री द्विजातिना कपिलेन” (Nīlakaṇṭha's
comment). The word महोदधि in this verse may be taken
as the name of a particular ocean. स तं देशं तदा पुत्रैः खानया-
मास पार्थिवः । आसेदुस्ते ततस्तत्र खन्यमाने महार्णवे ॥२३॥ तमादिपुरुषं
देवं हरिं कृष्णं प्रजापतिम् । विष्णुं कपिलरूपेण स्वपन्तं पुरुषोत्तमम् ॥२४॥
तस्य चक्षुः समुत्थेन तेजसा प्रतिबुध्यतः । दग्धा स्ते वै महाराज चत्वारस्त्व-
वशोपिताः ॥२५॥ (Harivamśa 1.14.23-25).

Far a full account of the whole episode beginning with Sagara's performing the horse sacrifice and ending with the burning of his sons to ashes by the fire created by the wrathful sage Kapila, readers should read some verses more preceding the verses referred to here. There is no need to give an account of the episode as it is wellknown to the readers of the Purāṇas.

Since the genealogical accounts in these Purāṇas seem to be brief, the non-mention of the incident does not prove that it was not known to the authors of these Purāṇas. The Brahmaparvata, the Devī-p., the Kālikā-p., the Mārkaṇḍeya-p., the Skanda-p., the Vāmana-p., and the Bhaviṣya-p. are silent on the king Sagara and his descendants. Though the Devī-Bhāgavata, which contains a reference to this incident, has chapters on the Solar race in the 7th book, yet it furnishes us with no information of Sagara or his sons, as it abruptly ends after giving an account of the life of the king Hariścandra (27.42) - a remote ancestor of Sagara.

According to us this non-mention is of great importance. It cannot be explained away by saying that since the 'mention of Kapila's promulgating Sāṃkhya' was of little significance, it had not been stated in the Purāṇic works. Since most of the epithets used in the aforesaid passages in the Purāṇas, Upapurāṇas and the epics (some are found to use more than five epithets to describe Kapila and some have more than three verses to describe him) are such as are commonplace and do not bear any important significance, the nonuse of such a significant epithet as 'the founder of Sāṃkhya' must be due to some real (i. e. historical) cause. According to us this cause is no other than the non-recognition by the authors of these Purāṇic works of the fact of burning by the founder of the Sāṃkhya system.

(B) That the philosopher Kapila was deemed as different from the destroyer Kapila by the Purāṇic authors may be fairly ascertained if the period of their appearance as shown in the Purāṇas is considered. While according to the Purāṇas the destroyer Kapila appeared in the Vaivasvata manvantara (the 7th manvantara) since Sagara belonged to the dynasty of Ikṣvāku, the son of Vaivasvata manu (Sagara appeared a few generations before Rāma Dāśarathī), the philosopher Kapila appeared in the Svāyambhuva manvantara (the 1st manvantara), for he is said to be the son of Devahūti, the daughter of Svāyambhuva Manu.⁷

7. Regarding Devahūti and Kardama (the parents of the philosopher Kapila) and Kapila's teachings to his mother, *vide* D. Bhāg. 8.3.12-19; Bhāgavata 3.24.6-19, Śiva-p. 2.1. 16.15, 2.5.16.13, Br. Vaivarta-p. 4.22.47; I.9.6. It is to be noted that no older Purāṇa contains any information about the parentage of Kapila. The Skanda-p. is found

use of the root स्वप् to recline, to rest, to lie down).¹⁰ It is quite likely that this sage remained in the state of 'suspended animation' for a very long period.¹¹

Like the difference in *manvantara*, we find difference in *yuga* also in connection with the appearance of these two Kapilas. While the Purāṇas place the philosopher Kapila in the Satya or Kṛta yuga (कृते युगे परं ज्ञानं कपिलादिस्वरूपधृक्, Viṣṇu-p. 3.2.54), they place Sagara in the Tretā yuga (Pargiter : A. I. H. T. p. 177).

(C) Moreover the Purāṇic declarations like 'the philosopher Kapila is the first incarnation of Viṣṇu in human form' (Viṣṇu-dharma, *vide* 'Studies in the Upapurāṇas', I, p. 146) place him to such an earlier period as cannot be assigned to the destroyer Kapila, who appeared some generations before Dāśarathī Rāma. Harivaṃśa 3.14.4 and Matsya-p. 171.4 speak of the presence of Kapila, the Sāṃkhya-teacher and Hiranyagarbha (Brahmā), the yoga-teacher in the earliest period of creation—a statement which shows that according to the Paurāṇikas the Sāṃkhya-teacher Kapila appeared long before the birth of the destroyer Kapila. In some of the Purāṇas (*vide* Vāyu-p. 65.53-54) Kardama, Kapila's father, is said to be a Prajāpati (one of the 21 Prajāpatīs; Śānti-p. 334.36-37).

(D) Purāṇic statements about the parentage of the two Kapilas do not seem to uphold the identity of the two Kapilas.

10. See the following verse of the Brahmaṇḍa-p. about the destroyer Kapila saying that he remained in the state of meditation for a period of one hundred divine years (अगस्त्यपीतसलिले दिव्यवर्षशतावधि । ध्यायन्नास्तेऽधुनाम्नोऽपि एकान्ते तत्र कुत्रचित् ॥ 2.52.16)
11. I have used the word 'suspended animation' in the Haṭhayogic sense of *śārīra roḍha*, which has great similarity with it. It is well-known that Haridāsa yogin, who was acquainted with the Sikh ruler Ranjit Singh, was able to remain in this state for a considerable length of time; *vide* W. G. Osborne : The Court and Camp of Runjeet Singh (p. 47 'in the course of ten months he remained under ground'); Dr. J. M. Honigburger : Physician to the Court of Lahore (pp. 126-130); Dr. Mc. Greegar : History of the Sikhs. Interested readers may profitably read the article 'Studies on Shri Ramanand Yogi during his stay in an air-tight box' in Indian Journal of Medical Research, 49 (1961).

While the Purāṇas inform us that the philosopher Kapila was the son of Devahūti and Kardama, they never ascribe the same parentage to the destroyer Kapila. The only information in this respect (which is mythical in character) is found in the Mbh. which says that the destroyer Kapila was born of the sun (सूर्याङ् जातो महानृषिः, विदुयं कपिलं देवं येनार्ताः सगरात्मजाः, Vana-p. 109. 17-18). It has however no connection with real parentage. The assertion of the Mahābhārata that the Sāṃkhya teacher Kapila is आदित्यस्थ (remaining in the sun, 339.68) cannot be taken as proving his identity with this Kapila.

(E) In connection with the incident of burning we find the Mahābhārata to declare that this sage was called Vāsudeva by people (वासुदेवेति यं प्राहुः कपिलं मुनिपुङ्गवम्, Vana-p. 107.32). That the destroyer Kapila was actually called by this name (or appellation) in ancient India is borne out by the following passage of the Śārīraka-bhāṣya on Br. sū. 2.1.1, “या तु श्रुतिः कपिलस्य....कपिलमिति श्रुतिसामान्यमाश्रित्वात् । अन्यस्य च कपिलस्य सगरपुत्राणां प्रतप्तुर्वासुदेवनाम्नः स्मरणात्”. (Mark the word वासुदेवनाम्नः). This shows that in the Rāmāyaṇa passage ‘ददृशुः कपिलं तत्र वासुदेवं सनातनम्’ (1.40.25) we are to take Vāsudeva as another name of Kapila and not as denoting the sense of ‘a divine being in which all reside’.¹² This however is a significant name (i. e. based on some *guṇa* or *karman* of the person concerned) as will be discussed in the sequel.

The philosopher Kapila is never said to have another name as Vāsudeva, though in a very few passages of the Purāṇas he is regarded as an incarnation or form of Viṣṇu. Such expressions simply show excellence, glory or divinity in the sage and they cannot be taken as proving real identity in the two Kapilas.

In the Udyoga-p of the Mbh. we find the statement that the sons of Sagara were destroyed by a great sage named Cakradhanu (109.17-18). The philosopher Kapila has never been called by this name. (*Vide infra* for a discussion on this name).

12. सर्वाणि तत्र भूतानि निवसन्ति परात्मनि ॥ ६८ ॥

भूतेषु च स सर्वात्मा वासुदेवस्ततः स्मृतः ।

भूतेषु वसते योज्यतर्कसन्त्यत्र च तानि यत् ॥ ६९ ॥

वाता निवसन्ति ज्वलन्ति वासुदेवस्ततः प्रभुः ॥ ७० ॥

(Brahma-p. 233.68-70).

(F) A consideration of the places associated with the two Kapilas reveals that one has no connection with the other. The philosopher Kapila is connected with the river Sarasvatī¹³, Bindusaras¹⁴ (being the places where his father Kardama resided), Pulaha-āśrama,¹⁵ and the river Ikṣumati.¹⁶ [It is not necessary to identify these here.] None of these has been mentioned in the Epic-Purāṇic passages that refer to the destroyer Kapila. Similarly the places mentioned in connection with the destroyer Kapila¹⁷ have never been mentioned in connection with the philosopher Kapila.

There is no need to deal here with the aforesaid Purāṇic passages in order to solve any contradiction or problem that may arise from them. We simply assert that none of the places referred to

13. तत्कर्ममाश्रमपदं सरस्वत्या परिभ्रितम् ।

स्वयंभूः साकमृषिभिर्मरीच्यादिभिरभ्यगात् ॥

Bhāg. 3.24.9; Kardama is the father of Kapila.

14. अथ संप्रस्थिते शुक्ले कर्दमो भगवानृषिः ।

आस्ते स्म बिन्दुसरसि तं कालं प्रतिपालयन् ॥

(Bhāg. 3.21.35)

15. देवहूत्यै परं ज्ञानं सर्वाविद्यानिवर्तकम् । १७

उपदिष्य महायोगी स ययौ पुलहाश्रमम् ॥ १९

(D. Bhāg. 8.3.17, 19). Mahāyogin refers to Kapila. If D. Bhāg. 9.21.16-18 are taken as referring to the philosopher Kapila, then the place (situated somewhere in South India) as described here is also to be accepted as connected with him. The name of the place is not given.

16. बभूवेक्ष्मन्तीतीरे कपिलर्षेर्वराश्रमम् (Viṣṇu-p. 2. 13. 48).

17. The places mentioned are: महातल (Bṛhaddharma-p. 2.22.41); प्रागुदक्दिश् (north-eastern direction, Bhāg. 9.8.10); पूर्वोत्तरदेश (Mbh. Vana-p. 107.28); मृहोदधि (Anuśāsana-p. 153.9); पूर्वदक्षिणसमुद्र (south-east ocean, Harivaṃśa 1.14.22; Brahmanḍa-p. 2.63.143; Brahma-p. 8. 53; Padma-p. 6. 21. 35). According to Udyoga-parvan 109.17-18 the destroyer Kapila resides in the southern direction. The statement of Viṣṇudharma (कपिलं पूर्वसागरे, Studies in the Upapurāṇas I, p. 123) may also be considered in this connection.

in connection with the destroyer Kapila has any connection with the philosopher Kapila—a fact which tends to disprove the identity of the two Kapilas.

(G) We find that some significant expressions, which are used as the epithets of the philosopher Kapila in the philosophical and Purāṇic works, have never been used in connection with the destroyer Kapila—a fact which undoubtdly shows that the authors of these works were aware of the difference between these two Kapilas.

The first epithet of this sort is *ādividvas*, which is used in connection with the philosopher Kapila in an aphoristic statement of Pāñcaśikha quoted in the Vyāsabhāṣya on Yogasūtra 1.25. We find the Purāṇas to declare that Kapila promulgated the science of the self. The destroyer Kapila has never been described in a similar way.

The second epithet is *siddheśvara* or words having a similar sense. These are found in Gītā 10.26, Brahma-vaivarta-p. 4.22.47, Bhāgavata-p. 3.24.19, Padma-p. 6.212.42-43 etc. (It is used in Sātvata-tantra 2.10 also.) None of these epithets is found in the Purāṇic passages describing the destroyer Kapila.

The third is *paramarṣi*, which is found in the aforesaid aphorism of Pāñcaśikha, in Sāṃkhya-kārikā 69 and in Śānti-p. 217. 1, 349.65, Vana-p. 220.21. Only once it has been used (in Viṣṇu-p. 4. 4.23) in connection with the destroyer Kapila.¹⁸

The epithet *mokṣadharmajña* is applied to the philosopher Kapila in Viṣṇu-p. 2.13.49 etc., which is highly significant, as Sāṃkhya is regarded as the philosophy of liberation (संख्यं तु मोक्षदर्शनम् Śānti p. 300.5). It has not been used in connection with the destroyer Kapila.

(H) As to the time and cause of the wrong identification, our views are as follows :

18. The word *paramarṣi* has a technical meaning also as stated in Vāyu-p. 59-80 (निवृत्तिसमकालं तु बुद्ध्याव्यक्तमृषिः स्वयम् । परं हि ऋषते यस्मात् परमविस्तवः स्मृतः ॥ ; the printed reading seems to be slightly corrupt) and in the Yuktidīpikā comm. on Sāṃ-kā 15 (यस्य सत्त्वप्रधानं कार्यकरणं स परमर्षिः). It appears that the Viṣṇu-purāṇa has used the word in its usually accepted sense of 'a great sage' (परमश्र्वासौ ऋषिश्च).

(i) Since the Purāṇic works (except the Bhāgavata) in their chapters on *varṇānucarita* do not state that the destroyer Kapila was also the founder of Sāṃkhya and since these chapters are rightly regarded as forming the older parts of the Purāṇic works, it is quite justified to hold that the wrong idea of identity of the two Kapilas arose long after the composition of these chapters and one or two centuries before the composition of the two Bhāgavatas. We have already said that the chapter on *varṇānucarita* in the Devībhāgavata are silent on the king Sagara and his descendants and the D. Bhag. speaks of the two Kapilas (in a separate section) while mentioning the bad effects of lust, wrath, etc.

(ii) The destroyer Kapila, on account of his burning the wicked sons of the king Sagara, came to be regarded by the Vaiṣṇava sects as an incarnation of Viṣṇu,¹⁹ who is always conceived as the protector of the *jīvas* even by destroying the wicked. Since the teachings of the philosopher Kapila are found to have been incorporated in the authoritative treatises of some of the ancient Vaiṣṇava sects (as may be proved by the 12th chapter of the Ahirbudhnyasāṃhitā dealing with the contents of the Śaṣṭitantra), it may be rightly presumed that the philosopher Kapila was also regarded as an incarnation of Viṣṇu by the ancient sects of Vaiṣṇava dharma²⁰. Since both the Kapilas were deemed as the forms of Viṣṇu there arose the idea in later times that the destroyer Kapila was the same as the philosopher Kapila.

(iii) It appears that the use of the word '*kapila*' as the 'name' also played an important part in creating the wrong idea of identity. The word *kapila* (adj.) means 'brown, tawny, reddish', and in this sense the word seems to have been used in connection with the destroyer sage (known by the name Cakradhanu or Vāsudeva) who had been described as having fire-like colour.²⁰ It may also be

19. So far as the Sāṃkhya tradition is concerned Kapila is regarded as आदिविद्वान्, परमर्षि, सहजातधर्मज्ञानवैराग्यैश्वर्यं and विश्वाग्रज.

20. कपिलं तेजसां राशिम्..... (बृहन्नारदीय० 8.123); कोटिसूर्यसमप्रभम् (बृहन्नारदीय० 8.99, नारदीय० 18.95); तेजोराशिमुत्तमम्। तेजसादीप्यमानं तु ज्वालाभिरिव पावकम् (वनपर्व 107.27); ज्वालामालमिवानलम् (ब्रह्माण्ड० 2.53.21).

surmised that since the colour *kapila* has a great resemblance to fire, the person who created fire from his body or eyes came to be called Kapila. [It may be noted in this connection that the act of creating fire from the body depends upon the supernormal power known as *samāna-jaya* and this power renders the body effulgent—Yogasūtra 3.40]. In connection with the philosopher, the word Kapila must be taken as his personal name.

There is however some difficulty in determining the proper name of the destroyer sage. We have already said that Śaṅkarācārya tells us that the name of this sage is Vāsudeva (वासुदेवापरनाम्नः) which is in consonance with the Vanaparvan-passage quoted above. Since the Mbh. in another parvan uses the word Cakradhanu as the name of this sage (अत्र चक्रधनुर्नाम्नः) a doubt arises about the actual personal (proper) name of the sage. It would be too much to assume that there were two different traditions regarding the incident of burning the sons of Sagara. It is quite reasonable to think that Cakradhanu was the name given by the parents of the sage in the 'ceremony of naming' and afterwards the sage came to be called Vāsudeva on account of his similarity with Viṣṇu as stated above. It may also be surmised that since the Mbh. does not say चक्रधनुर्नाम्ना (i. e. *nāman* in the third case-ending),²¹ the word Cakradhanu may be taken as an epithet. We are however in favour of taking Cakradhanu as the personal name, for the word as an epithet has no obvious fitness in its context and as far as I know the word is not found as a name of any other sage.

(iv) We have already said that the statement showing identity of the two Kapilas is found in the Bhāgavata and the Devī-bhāgavata only. As to which of these two Purāṇas spoke of the identity at first we think it more reasonable to hold that the mistaken idea arose at first in the author of the Bhāgavata and this is why he, being aware of the divine nature of the philosopher Kapila,

21. If the word *nāman* is not used in the third case-ending it may signify simply प्रसिद्धि and not a 'proper name'; cp. नाम प्रसिद्धौ । नामपदस्य संज्ञार्थत्वे प्रकृत्यादिभ्य उपसंख्यानम् इति तृतीयया भाष्यमित्यवधेयम् (Comm. by Rucipati Upādhyāya on Anargharāghava 1.3). This is why sometimes we find the use of both नाम and नाम्ना in the same sentence : नारिषा नाम नाम्ना (Viṣṇu-p. 1.15.8).

tried to exonerate him from the fault of violence—the greatest fault for a yogin—by offering the explanation embodied in verses 9.8.13-14. As these Bhāgavata verses put the explanation in a highly philosophical way and as they do not point to the real cause directly, while the Devībhāgavata verse (6.15.42) does not say anything philosophically but directly mentions a popular cause (viz. *daivayoga*) it follows that the author of the D. Bhāg. came to know of this explanation from the Bhāgavata. That the explanation of the D. Bhāg. is nothing but a popular version of what the Bhāgavata says in a philosophical way may be readily accepted.

(I) As the author of the Bhāgavata²² is sometimes found to deal with the tales and incidents of ancient times independently²³

22. According to us the Bhāgavata is later than the older parts of all the earlier Purāṇas. Our study of the Bhāgavata reveals that the Bhāgavata was composed by a single person who was highly learned and was a follower of Vaiṣṇava śāstra, especially the Pañcarātra Āgama. By utilizing the Purāṇic materials he composed a *kāvya* giving it a Purāṇic character. This is why the nature of the composition of the Bhāgavata is not similar to that of the other Purāṇic works which have been composed by different persons (belonging to different or even rival sects) at different times. The original forms of these Purāṇas have been revised in various ways from time to time by using the process of incorporation, augmentation and rejection. This is why all of these Purāṇas have, unlike the Bhāgavata, more than one version or recension. Only a few verses seem to have been interpolated in the Bhāgavata. In a forthcoming paper we shall demonstrate our view in detail.
23. A remarkable example of this tendency of the author of the Bhāgavata is his assertion that Śuka, the son of Vyāsa, narrated the Bhāgavata-purāṇa to the king Parīkṣit (1.3.41-42), who has born just after the Bhārata war (Aśvamedha-p. 66.8). But according to the Mahābhārata (which was known to the author of the Bhāgavata as it has been referred to in Bhāgavata 1.4.25) Śuka left his mortal coil before the Bhārata war (Sānti-p. 333). Since Śuka was highly praised in the Mahābhārata the author of the Bhāgavata deliberately connected him with the Bhāgavata with a view to proving the exalted character of the Bhāgavata dharma. Curiously enough though the last days of the king Parīkṣit have been described in the Mahābhārata beginning with the curse uttered by the sage Śamika and ending with the biting of the Takṣaka nāga with great detail (Ādiparvan 40-43), yet there is no mention of his hearing the Bhāgavata from Śuka.

(i.e. he does not follow the accounts as given in the older works) it is more plausible to presume that he deliberately identified the philosopher Kapila with the destroyer Kapila to serve some purpose. The purpose seems to show that Viṣṇu (Kapila is regarded as an incarnation of Viṣṇu in 1.3.10) protects the world even by causing destruction directly or indirectly. Since the Vaiṣṇava author of the Bhāgavata took the sage Kapila as an expounder of *ātmajñāna* or a promulgator of *mokṣasāstra* he thought it illogical to conceive that Kapila created fire in order to burn some persons to ashes (even though they were wicked). This is why he declared that the sons of Sagara were burnt by the fire of their own bodies (स्वशरीराग्निना भस्मसादभवन् 9.8.12)—a statement which suggests that they were burnt as a result of their own sinful acts²⁴ and that there was no agency or volition of Kapila in the act of burning.

The Bhāgavata words 'नृपेन्द्रपुत्रा मुनिकोपभजिता इति न साधुवादः' clearly indicate that the incident of burning of the wicked sons of Sagara by Kapila was regarded as an established fact in the Purāṇic tradition and that from older Purāṇas the author of the Bhāgavata knew that the wicked sons of the king Sagara were really consumed by the fire created by the sage. As he connected the act of burning with the philosopher Kapila (either ignorantly or deliberately) he tried to justify the act in his own way.

24. Like the Bhāgavata, Viṣṇu-p. 4.4.11 also says स्वशरीरसमुत्थेन अग्निना दह्यमाना विनेशुः. Though all Purāṇic works except these two expressly state that fire was created by Kapila from his eyes or his body (i.e. Kapila's volition was active in producing the fire) which burnt the sons of Sagara into ashes, the author of the Viṣṇu-p. (who was a Vaiṣṇava) tried to minimize the agency of Kapila in the act of burning. That there was some connection between Kapila and the act of burning is admitted by this Purāṇa as is proved from the words कपिलतेजसा दग्धम् stated just after the above passage. In this respect the author of the Bhāgavata seems to follow the Viṣṇu-p. (which however does not regard the destroyer Kapila as the founder of Sāṃkhya of whom it speaks in connection with the life of Jada Bharata in sec II.) but he went one step further and declared that there was no rise of wrath in Kapila. Since the author of the Bhāgavata took this Kapila as identical with the philosopher Kapila he was compelled to express the above view.

There are, however, strong grounds to believe that the author of the Bhāgavata changed the incident in the aforesaid manner deliberately. Though the Bhāgavata says that the sons of Sagara were burnt by the fire born of their own bodies, yet it mentions 'Kapila's opening the eyes' (उन्मिषे तदा मुनिः, 9.8.11). What was the use of opening the eyes by Kapila possessing an absolutely pacified mind if the fire was born of the bodies of the persons (who were burnt) without having any connection with Kapila's volition or activity? Does it not indicate that the author of the Bhāgavata was personally aware of the incident as described in the older Purāṇas and that he described the incident changing it slightly in order to serve some purpose? ²⁵

The reason afforded by the Bhāgavata (9.8.13-14) with a view to exonerating the sage from the sin of violence was deemed so justified that in later times it was reiterated (in a popular form) by the author of the Brahmandapurāṇa in 2.52.29-31²⁶ (the chapter is however not on *vaṁśānucarita*) in connection with the destroyer Kapila, who is not regarded by this Purāṇa as the founder of Sāṁkhya.

(J) The present writer is of opinion that if the act of burning the sons of Sagara is judged in accordance with the principles of *adhyātmavidyā*, it cannot be attributed to the philosopher Kapila. We find the historical statement of Pañcāsikha (quoted in the Vyāsabhāṣya on Yogasūtra 1.25) that Kapila instructed Āsuri in Sāṁkhya by assuming a *nirmāṇa-citta*. Since this *citta* is caused by *dhyāna* it is bereft of all latent impressions (Vide Yogasūtra 4.6). It is inconceivable that a yogin possessing such a high stage gets so highly enraged that he becomes compelled to create fire to kill

25. Some Āgamic works are found to speak of the Sāṁkhya teacher Kapila. It may be surmized that the author of an Āgama work identified the philosopher Kapila with the destroyer Kapila and the author of the Bhāgavata, who was a follower of Vaiṣṇava Āgamas, simply re-stated the view of his tradition with his own observations.

26. स्वकर्मणैव निर्दग्धाः प्रविनङ्क्ष्यन्ति सागराः ॥२९॥ काले प्राप्ते तु युष्माभिः स तावत् परिपाल्यताम् । अहं तु कारणं तेषां विनाशाय दुरात्मनाम् ॥३०॥ भविष्यामि सुरश्रेष्ठा भवतामर्थसिद्धये । (ब्रह्माण्ड-२।५२।२९क—३१ख.) Here कारण is the same as the निमित्तमात्र in the Gītā (11,33).

some persons however wicked they are. It is well known that these yogins are so powerful that even evil thoughts of wicked persons get restricted if they happen to come near them.²⁷

The destroyer Kapila seems to be a yogin of a lower stage though he possessed certain supernormal powers. It may be easily accepted that this Kapila (who appeared at the time of the king Sagara) cannot be regarded as *ādivīdvas*, cannot be recalled in the act of *manuṣya-tarpaṇa* (vide the Gṛhya-sūtras etc.), cannot be described as ऋषि प्रसूतं कपिलं यस्तमग्रे (Śvetāśvatara-up.4.5) and cannot be regarded as a mind-born son of Brahmā appearing at the earliest period of creation. All these show that the ancient Indian tradition did not recognize the two Kapilas as one.

(K) We want to conclude this discussion by presenting a problem regarding the time of the Sāṃkhya teacher Kapila.

We have already said that there are Purāṇic statements that place Kapila in the Svāyambhuva manvantara or in the Satya yuga or in the earlier period of creation. Such statements must be regarded as of mythical character and they simply mean that Kapila was a man of hoary past.

But in the Mahābhārata we find such statements of non-mythical character as seem to place Kapila at a much later period, thus giving rise to a grave contradiction.

It is said in the Śānti-p., that Pāṇcasīkha (the disciple of Āsuri, the disciple of Kapila) taught Dharmadhvaja Janaka, king of the Videha country, in Sāṃkhya (320.4,24).²⁸ We find no mention

27. The Kālikā-p., which has no chapter on varṇānucarita and which does not say even incidentally anything about the killing of the sons of Sagara by Kapila, describes in chap. 32 an incident which shows vehement wrath of the Sāṃkhya teacher Kapila (as may be inferred from verses 12-13) to Svāyambhuva Manu. This must be due to the confusion that the philosopher Kapila is identical with the destroyer Kapila.

28. The Śānti-p. says that the king Janadeva Janaka was also taught by Pāṇcasīkha (218-219). This king has not been mentioned in the Purāṇic lists of the Janaka dynasty and the Mahābhārata does not say anything about his time.

of Dharmadhvaja Janaka in the genealogical lists in the Purāṇas²⁹ except in the list in the Bhāgavata. According to this Purāṇa Dharmadhvaja appeared one generation after Śīradhvaja, the father-in-law of Dāśarathi Rāma (9.13.18-20) who was born some generations after the king Sagara. Accepting the Bhāgavata genealogy as valid a question presents itself—if the grand-disciple of the philosopher Kapila taught a person who appeared one generation after the father-in-law of Rāma, how can Kapila be held as appearing in the Kṛta yuga or in the Svāyambhuva manvantara as stated before so far as the Purāṇic view is concerned ?

It should be noted here that this Kapila (i. e. the teacher of Pāñcaśikha who instructed Dharmadhvaja) cannot be regarded as the destroyer Kapila, for there is a period covering more than 20 generations between Sagara and Daśaratha, a contemporary of Śīradhvaja. We have already shown that (i) no Purāṇic work (except the two Bhāgavatas) says that the destroyer Kapila was the founder of Sāṃkhya and that (ii) the ancient Indian tradition never seems to have ascribed those activities and characteristics to the destroyer Kapila that exclusively or especially belong to the philosopher Kapila.

The aforesaid problem seems to be highly perplexing and I plead my inability to solve it.

29. Brahmāṇḍa-p. 3.64.1-24; Vāyu-p. 89.1-23; Viṣṇu-p. 4.5. 11-14; Garuḍa-p. 1.138.44-48; Bhāgavata 9.13.1-27; Rāmāyaṇa 1.71.3-20. Though the Viṣṇu-p. does not mention Dharmadhvaja in the genealogy of the Janaka dynasty yet it mentions him in connection with the Keśidhvaja-Khāṇḍikya dialogue (6.6). That this Dharmadhvaja is identical with Dharmadhvaja in the dynastical list in the Bhāgavata is beyond doubt.

LOCATION OF THE NAIMIŚA FOREST

O. P. BHARADWAJ

[पुराणकथितं नैमिषा(शा)रण्यम् उत्तर-प्रदेशान्तर्गत-सीतापुरमण्डले (लखनऊ-नगर्याः पश्चिमोत्तरस्यां दिशि) विद्यत इति प्रसिद्धम्; इदमिदानीं 'निमसार' इति, 'निमखारवन' इति बोध्यते । नैमिषारण्यमिदं कुरुक्षेत्रान्तर्गत-मिति पाण्डुरङ्गवामनकाणे-महोदयस्य मतम् । उभे एते मते मिराशीमहोदयेन खण्डिते । मुलतानपुरमण्डले अयोध्यायाः समीपे नैमिषारण्यस्य स्थिति रिति मिराशी-महोदयेन प्रतिपादितम् ।

काणे-महोदयस्य मतमेव संगतमिति लेखकेन निबन्धेऽस्मिन् स्थापितम् । लेखकोक्ता इमा मुख्या युक्तयः—नैमिषीयाः कुरुक्षेत्रे दीर्घसत्राणि चक्रुरिति कथनं वेदादिषु प्राचीनग्रन्थेषूपलभ्यते । अतो नैमिषारण्यं कुरुक्षेत्रान्तर्गतमित्येव संभाव्यते । कुरुक्षेत्र-संबद्धाः केचन पुरुषा नैमिषा नैमिषीया वा पुराणेपूक्ताः । पृथूदक-विनशनयोर्मध्ये नैमिषस्य स्थितिरासीदिति देवलधर्म-सूत्रतो विज्ञायते । महाभारते नैमिषविषये यानि विवरणानि उपलभ्यन्ते, तानि कुरुक्षेत्रान्तर्गते नैमिषे सुष्ठु संगतानि भवन्तीति दृश्यते । पुराणे महा-भारते च सन्ति सन्दर्भाः, ये न केवलं नैमिषारण्यं कुरुक्षेत्रं च परस्परसंबद्धं दर्शयन्ति, प्रत्युत नैमिषं कुरुक्षेत्रान्तर्गतमित्यपि स्पष्टं बोधयन्ति । स्कन्द-पुराणीय-सनत्मुजात-संहितायां नैमिषारण्यस्य यादृशं वर्णनमुपलभ्यते ततोऽपि विज्ञायते यदिदमरण्यं सरस्वती-दृषद्वत्योर्मध्ये (अर्थात् कुरुक्षेत्र-प्रदेशे) स्थितमासीदिति ।]

Naimiṣāranya or the Naimiśa¹ forest is usually identified with Nimsar or Nimkharvan at a short distance from the Nimsar station of the old Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway, 20 miles from Sitapur and 45 miles to the north-west of Lucknow.² The similarity between the two names is obvious.

P. V. Kane,³ however, locates the sacred forest, where most of the Purāṇas are said to have been recited, in Kurukṣetra on the

1. The cerebral ξ in place of the palatal seems to be a later appearance; cf. Vedic Index, i.460.
2. Dey, Nando Lal: The Geographical Dictionary of Ancient and Mediaeval India, 3rd ed. Delhi 1971, p. 135.
3. History of the Dharmaśāstra, Vol. IV, Poona 1953, p.783.

basis of a detailed reference in the Vāyu Purāṇa. V. V. Mirashi⁴ rejects both these views and places it somewhere in the Sultanpur district of Uttar Pradesh, not very far from both Ayodhyā and the hermitage of Vālmiki, in the light of the testimony of the Purāṇas and the Epics. Although the name Naimiṣāranya appears to have been applied to a forest in the Uttar-Pradesh also it is proposed to show here that this was a later development and that the original forest of this name was situated in Kurukṣetra as believed by Prof. Kane.

From early Vedic times Naimiśa finds mention as the name of a region and the dwellers of this region are called Naimiṣīyas⁵ or Naimiṣeyas.⁶ In the Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa⁷ even an individual Ṛṣi named Śitibāhu Aiṣakṛta is accorded the epithet of Naimiṣi on account of his residence in Naimiśa and a monkey is said to have run off with his sacrificial cake.

Later the Mahābhārata⁸ and Bṛhatsamhitā⁹ also mention it as the name of a region or its people although by this time it was popularly known as a forest.

The Naimiṣīyas are known to literature as performers of Sattras or long sacrificial sessions in Kurukṣetra or Naimiṣāranya. These Sattras often continued for as long as twelve years at a stretch¹⁰ and sometimes even longer than that.¹¹ It could hardly be possible for Ṛṣis to travel all the way from Nimsar to Kurukṣetra and then stay away from their dwellings for Sattras of such long durations. Apparently the Naimiśa, which abounded in the hermitages of Ṛṣis was only a part of Kurukṣetra so that a Sattra undertaken there

-
4. Purāṇa Vol. X, No. 1 (Feb. 1968) pp. 27-34.
 5. Vedic Index, i. 460.
 6. Mbh. (Gita Press) Śalya, 37.41-42.
 7. i. 364; Also cf. Vedic Index, ii. 379.
 8. Karṇa., 45.30.
 9. Chaukhamba, Varanasi 1977, 11.60.
 10. Pañcaviṃśa Brāhmaṇa (P. B.) XXV, 6.4. & Mbh. Śalya, 37.41-43.
 11. Vāyu i. 2.5. and Bhāgavata 1.1.4 ff. speak of a 1000 year sacrifice. So does P. B. XXV 17 & V. 18. Also see P. B. XXV. 7. for a 36 year Sattra & P. B. XXV. 8. for a 100 year Sattra.

could at the same time be said to have been performed in Kurukṣetra too.

A number of personalities definitely known to be connected with Kurukṣetra are associated with Naimiśa and Naimiśīyas. The Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa¹² speaks of Daivodāsi Pratardana going to a sacrificial session of the Naimiśīyas. Pratardana was connected with the Tṛtsu Bharatas¹³ and his father Divodāsa defeated the Paṇis, Pārāvatas and Vṛṣayas on the bank of the Sarasvatī¹⁴ according to the Ṛgveda.¹⁵ The Kāthaka Saṁhitā¹⁶ describes a sacrifice of the Naimiśīyas at which they tied 27 calves in Kuru Pañcālas. Baka Dālbhya also participated in it. According to the Chāndogya Upaniṣad¹⁷ too he officiated as a chanter of the Sāmaveda for the Naimiśīyas.

He belonged to Kuru Pañcālas¹⁸ and once visited the assembly of Yudhiṣṭhira.¹⁹ In the Vāmana Purāṇa²⁰ he is said to have been visited by Dhṛtarāṣṭra at the Avakīrṇatīrtha in Pṛthūdaka or Pehova. The Jaiminiya Brāhmaṇa²¹ connects the Naimiśīyas with the Gṛhapatis of Somaśuśma who was the Udgātā in a sacrifice of Hṛtaśvāsaya Āllakeya, the king of the Mahāvṛṣas²² who occupied the north-western part of Kurukṣetra and had the Śakambharas as their neighbours.²³ These references acquire great importance when

12. XXVI. 5.

13. Keith, A. B. : Ṛgveda Brāhmaṇas, Reprint Delhi 1971, Intro, p. 45.

14. Cf. Asim Kumar Chatterjee : Political History of Pre-Buddhist India, Calcutta 1980, p. 9.

15. VI. 61.1.

16. X. 6.

17. i. 2.13.

18. Vedic Index ii. 58.

19. Mbh. Sabhā, 4.11.

20. Ed. A. S. Gupta with Hindi tr., Varanasi 1968, S. M. 18, 25-32.

21. i. 363.

22. i. 234. The compound form Kurumahāvṛṣa (Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa-Kāṇva Rec. 4. 2. 3. 10.) like Kurupañcāla suggests that the Mahāvṛṣas were either a part or neighbours of the Kurus.

23. Vedic Index ii. 132.

it is remembered that Kurukṣetra was the centre of sacrificial culture of the Brāhmaṇic age. Dr Keith²⁴ therefore rightly associates the Naimiśīyas with the Kuru country.

This position is very clearly supported by the Lawgiver Devala²⁵ who is quoted in the Kṛtyakalpataru of Lakṣmīdhara²⁶ as naming the following tīrthas of the Sarasvatī: Plakṣapṛāsravaṇa, Vṛddhakanyāka, Sārasvata, Vamśodbheda, Āditya, Kaubera, Vaijayanta, Pṛthūdaka, Naimiśa, Vinaśana, Vamśodbheda and Prabhāsa. The list begins with the source of the Sarasvatī²⁷ and gives the location of Naimiśa somewhere between Pṛthūdaka²⁸ and Vinaśana²⁹. It was probably not far from Vinaśana which has been described in the Brāhmaṇas and Śrautasūtras as the starting point of the Sārasvata³⁰ and Dārṣadvata³¹ sacrificial sessions.

The Mahābhārata contains several references to Naimiśa, some of which throw light on its situation. A tīrtha Naimiśa-Kuñja³² is specifically mentioned on the Sarasvatī in Kurukṣetra and connected with the Naimiśīyas. Naimiśa is described as one of the tīrthas on Gomatī and the Kanyātīrtha, Aśvatīrtha, Gavāmtīrtha, Kālakoṭi Vṛṣapṛastha and Bāhudā are named in the same region.³³ Some of

24. *op. cit.* Intro. p. 45.

25. A contemporary of Kātyāyana dated between A.D. 400 & 600. See the Classical Age, Ed. R. C. Majumdar, Bombay 1954, p. 299. His complete work is not available.

26. Ed. Rangaswami Aiyangar K. V., G. O. S. Baroda 1942, p. 250.

27. Bharadwaj O. P.: Plakṣapṛāsravaṇa, A.B.O.R.I. Diamond Jubilee Volume.

28. Identified with Pehoa on the Sarasvatī river, 14 miles to the west of Thansar. Cunningham Alexander : A. S. I. R. Vol. XIV. Reprint, Varanasi 1970, p. 101.

29. Identified with the region of Kalibangan in district Ganganagar of Rajasthan. Bharadwaj, O. P.: Vinaśana, Paper presented at the A.I. O. C. Shantiniketan (1980) Session.

30. e. g. Pañcaviṃśa Brāhmaṇa XXV. 10, XXV. 11., XXV. 12 and Āśvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra VI. 6 etc.

31. e. g. Pañcaviṃśa Brāhmaṇa XXV. 13. and Kātyāyana Śrauta Sūtra, XXIV. 6 etc.

32. Vana, 83.109-110.

33. Vana, 95. 1-4.

these tīrthas can be identified in Kurukṣetra in the Epic itself. Kanyātīrtha is mentioned after Naimiśa-Kuñja on the Sarasvatī.³⁴ Gavāmtīrtha is probably the same as Gavāmbhavana³⁵ identified with Gohana in district Sonipat.³⁶ And Bāhudā has been mentioned with Dṛṣadvatī after Gomatī and Dhūtapāpā.³⁷ It is also recommended for a visit immediately after the Sarasvatī.³⁸ Vṛṣaprasatha is apparently the same tīrtha which is elsewhere mentioned as Triviṣṭapa and recommended for the worship of Vṛṣadhvaṇa Śūlapāṇi.³⁹ Some of these names are associated with the region of Kanauj⁴⁰ also but the phenomenon of a name applying to several tīrthas at the same time is too common in our country to be taken seriously.⁴¹ Apart from that Kurukṣetra being the cradle of Indian culture the balance of probability is more in favour of their travelling from this region to other directions in the sub-continent.

In the Śalya Parva⁴² occurs the story of the origin of the tīrtha called Naimiśa-Kuñja which appears to have been an extension of the Naimiśa and situated closer to the Sarasvatī. It is said that once in the Kṛtayuga such a large number of Ṛṣis collected at a twelve-year sacrifice in Naimiśa that the tīrthas on the southern bank of the Sarasvatī looked like towns. The Ṛṣis then spread right upto Samantapañcaka and, finding no room to stay near the holy river, had to stop away from it for performing sacrifices. Out of consideration for them the Sarasvatī took a turn east-ward and created many Kuñjas or bowers overgrown with plants and creepers before returning to her normal course. This is apparently an explanation of the name Prācī-Sarasvatī given to the river where it turns eastward near Pṛthūdaka or Pehoa in district

34. Vana, 83.112.

35. Vana, 83.50.

36. Agrawala, V.S.: Vāmana Purāṇa-A Study, Varanasi. 1964, p. 188.

37. Vāmana, 13.21. It is possible that Dhūtapāpā has been used as an adjective here.

38. Vana, 84.66-67.

39. Vana, 83.84, and Vāmana, S. M. 15. 41-42.

40. See Dey under relevant entries.

41. See e.g. Dey under entries on Kapāla-Mocana, Kanyā-tīrtha, Cakratīrtha and Dharmāraṇya etc.

42. 37.36-57.

Kurukṣetra.⁴³ The story brings out the association of Naimiśa and the Naimiśīyas with the Sarasvatī and Kurukṣetra in no uncertain terms. At another place⁴⁴ the Epic describes the river Kāñcanākṣī, one of the seven tributaries of the Sarasvatī, all of which join it in the tīrtha Saptasārasvata, as flowing through Naimiśa. Saptasārasvata, too, is a Sārasvata tīrtha of Kurukṣetra and was evidently located not far from Naimiśa.⁴⁵ And finally the Naimiśas are mentioned with Kurus, Pañcālas and Matsyas as people who understood Dharma.⁴⁶

Some of the Purāṇas also contain material which is equally helpful. We can begin with a reference to some interesting observations made by Giorgio Bonazzoli in an article on the 'Place of Purāṇic Recitation'.⁴⁷ Fifteen of the Purāṇas mention the place of their recitation. Out of these, six name more than one place of narration while ten mention Naimiśāranya in this regard although it is not given this privilege exclusively.⁴⁸ Bonazzoli, however, believes that the place they mention describes a moment of Purāṇic evolution rather than a topographic spot.⁴⁹ From the point of similarity between the two he concludes that Naimiśa and Kurukṣetra represent two aspects of the same Purāṇic layer. As he points out both the spots host a twelve-year-long sacrifice and both at the beginning of Kaliyuga. In both the places we meet with Lomaharṣaṇa, the Sūta, and the Ṛṣis led by Śaunaka (see Skanda II. 1.1.1. and II. 8.18). Moreover, the Ṛṣis at Kurukṣetra, according to Vāyu I. 1.11-12, are called Naimiśīyas. The Ṛṣis who attended the Purāṇas are also often called Naimiśīyas. (see Kūrma I. 1.2, Garuḍa 1.5, Brahmāṇḍa I. 1.37) This implies that they were exactly the same persons present at Kurukṣetra as well as Naimiśāranya.⁵⁰ This striking equality of everything at Kurukṣetra and

43. Vāmana, 23. 43.

44. Śalya, 38.19-20.

45. Vana, 83. 115-133. It is traditionally located at village Mangna 5 miles to the west of Pehoa. See A.S.I.R. XIV. p. 100.

46. Karṇa, 45.30.

47. Purāṇa Vol. XXIII, No. 1. Jan. 81. pp. 48-61.

48. *ibid.* p. 49.

49. *ibid.* p. 53.

50. *ibid.* p. 58.

Naimiṣa is attributed by Bonazzoli to an enthusiastic movement at the beginning of Kaliyugā which was spread all over the Madhyadeśa by itinerant Ṛṣis performing sacrifices and narrating old stories. According to him two literary and religious streams of the Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas took shape in this movement and the same persons in the same period did the same things but in two different places, at Kurukṣetra, traditional place of the Mahābhārata and at Naimiṣaraṇya, traditional place of the Purāṇas.

Now this explanation, in our opinion, relies on the assumption of a coincidence which is not only improbable but also superfluous in view of the availability of a more simple and straight explanation. As we shall see the place of recitation is mentioned, at least in some of the Purāṇas, so clearly and with such specific details that it obviously describes a topographic spot or region rather than a movement of Purāṇic evolution and the connection between the Purāṇas and the Mahābhārata arises from the fact that Naimiṣaraṇya and Kurukṣetra both refer to the same country with the qualification that one formed a part of the other.

This is indeed the only explanation of a couple of situations presented in the Purāṇas. For instance in the Skanda Purāṇa according to II. 8.18 Lomahaṛṣaṇa tells the Kathā to Śaunaka and the Ṛṣis at Kurukṣetra while according to II. 1.1.1. he appears to have told it at Naimiṣa. In Padma Purāṇa I. 1.2. ff. Ṛṣis and Munis are described as converging at Naimiṣa from different places for performing a sacrifice and listening to Purāṇic Kathās while in Skanda Purāṇa II. 8.1.7. they are said to have gathered for the same purpose at Kurukṣetra. These two situations have been noted by Bonazzoli⁵¹ but a few more are available elsewhere. According to Bhāgavata Purāṇa I. 1.4. ff. Śaunaka and other sages gather at Naimiṣa in a thousand-year sacrifice where Sūta is requested to narrate the noble doings of the Lord whereas in I. 7.2-6 Vyāsa is said to have composed the Sātvata Samhitā in his hermitage named Śamyāprāsa on the western bank of Brahmanadī Sarasvatī. The Kūrma Purāṇa⁵² in its Naimiṣa Mahātmya declares that the Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa was narrated by Vāyu to the Ṛṣis engaged in a Sattra in this holy forest. The Brahmāṇḍa⁵³ itself, on

51. *ibid.* p. 52-53.

52. Mansukh Rai Mor ed. ii. 43.14.

53. Ed. J. L. Sastri, Delhi 1973, i. 1.27 ff. & i. 1.160.

the other hand asserts that it was recited in Kurukṣetra on the bank of the Dṛṣadvatī. Bonazzoli⁵⁴ draws our attention to another striking fact. The Kurukṣetra Māhātmya⁵⁵ does not mention any Purāṇic recitation held at Kurukṣetra as normally it should. On the contrary it affirms that the place where Śaunaka, the foremost of Ṛṣis, enquires about river Sarasvatī of Lomahaṛṣaṇa (i. e. Sūta) is not Kurukṣetra but Naimiśa. He rightly finds it strange that even for the Kurukṣetra Māhātmya, the Purāṇas or some of them should be recited at Naimiśa and that such a statement should be found in a Māhātmya which is supposed to speak of Purāṇic events at Kurukṣetra and not at Naimiśa. All these apparently conflicting situations point to, and are consistent with, the location of Naimiśāranya in Kurukṣetra which can be supported with Purāṇic testimony of a definitive nature.

In the Vāmana Purāṇa the rivers Kāñcanākṣī-Sarasvatī, Gomatī and Gurudā (Bāhudā ?) are connected with one another and with Naimiśa.⁵⁶ The Gomatī is said to join the Sarasvatī⁵⁷ which lends plausibility to its identification with the Dṛṣadvatī by Dr Kane. Prahlāda, the Demon king, goes with his Daityas to Naimiśa and, while hunting after a bath there, reaches the river Sarasvatī which is flowing with clear water.⁵⁸ In another story Citrāṅgadā, daughter of Viśvakarmā, visits Naimiśa to take a bath⁵⁹ and falls in love with king Suratha who is carried away thirteen yojanas by the Sarasvatī, as a result of being cursed by her father.⁶⁰ Citrāṅgadā also jumps into the river Kāñcanākṣī-Sarasvatī which throws her into the great river Gomatī.⁶¹ And as if to remove any doubt that may still be left the Vāmana mentions Naimiśa among the tīrthas of Kurukṣetra between Pavanahrada and Sapta-Sārasvata⁶² where the seven Sarasvatīs, including the Kāñca-

54. *op. cit.* p. 57.

55. Vāmana, S. M. 16.24 ff.

56. 57. 1-3.

57. 37. 60-61.

58. 7.41-42.

59. 37.40.

60. 37.54.

61. 37.60-61.

62. S. M., 16.6-8.

nākṣi, join and then flow together.⁶³ So does the Brahma Purāṇa⁶⁴ where it is bracketted with many Kurukṣetra tīrthas like Pāṇi-khāta,⁶⁵ Mīsraka,⁶⁶ Madhuvāṭa,⁶⁷ Kauśikī,⁶⁸ R̥ṇamocana,⁶⁹ Koṭitīrtha,⁷⁰ Somatīrtha,⁷¹ Kanyātīrtha,⁷² Saugandhikavana,⁷³ Sarasvatī, Saptasārasvata, Sthāṇutīrtha⁷⁴ and Kapālamocana⁷⁵ etc.

The references in the Vāyu Purāṇa are even more explicit. It describes the Sūta as going to see the Ṛṣis who, duly initiated according to the Śāstras while living in Naimiṣāranya, were performing a long Sattra in Dharmakṣetra Kurukṣetra on the bank of the sacred Dṛṣadvatī.⁷⁶ The expression used is 'Naimiṣāranya-gocarāḥ' which should mean 'frequenting, dwelling or resorting to Naimiṣāranya' and (at the same time) performing a Sattra in Kurukṣetra. Here too the author is anxious to eliminate all possibility of doubt and adds the names of a number of renowned personalities connected with Naimiṣa. They are Rohiṇī, mother of Budha, father of Purūravā, Vasiṣṭha, his wife Arundhatī and his eldest son, Śakti, and grandson Parāśara, king Kalmāṣapāda who was cursed by Śakti, Viśvāmitra who was the avowed enemy of Vasiṣṭha and king Purūravā himself in whose time the Sattra took place.⁷⁷ Their association with the land of Kurukṣetra and the holy Sarasvatī is only too well-known.⁷⁸ The Vāyu does not even

63. S. M., 16.17-18.

64. Mansukh Rai Mor ed. i, 25.44.

65. Cf. Mbh. Vana, 83.89 & Vāmana, S. M. 15.51.

66. Mbh. Vana. 83.94. & Vāmana, S. M. 15.52.

67. Mbh. Vana. 83.94 & Vāmana, S. M. 15.55.

68. Mbh. Vana. 83.95 & Vāmana, S. m. 13.18.

69. Vāmana, S. M. 20.6.

70. Mbh. Vana. 83.17 & Vāmana, S. M. 13.28.

71. Mbh. Vana. 83.114 & Vāmana, S. M. 20.4. & 13. 33-35.

72. Mbh. Vana. 83.112 & Vāmana, 57.43.

73. Mbh. Vana. 84.4 & Vāmana, S. M. 26.55.

74. Mbh. Śalya, 42:4-7 & Vāmana, S. M. 19.3.

75. Mbh. Vana, 83.137 & Vāmana, S. M. 18.13.

76. i. 1.12.

77. i. 2.8. ff.

78. For Purūravas & others connected with him see Bharadwaj, O. P. : Identification of Ludhiana, Purāṇa Vol. VII, No. 2 (July 1975) pp. 103-117 and Vol. XXI, No. 2 (July 1979) pp. 177-193; for Vasiṣṭha & Viśvāmitra, Mbh. 42.4; for Śakti, Kalmāṣapāda and rivalry of Vasiṣṭha & Viśvāmitra, Brahmanḍa i. 1.2.11.

admit of the possibility of Ṛṣis going from Naimiśāranya all the way to Kurukṣetra to perform the sacrifice. It declares that they were called Naimiśeyas since they performed the Sattrā in Naimiśa.⁷⁹ The implication is too obvious to need elaboration.

The only other Purāṇa that defines the location of Naimiśāranya in most unambiguous terms is the Brahmāṇḍa⁸⁰ which follows the Vāyu on this subject almost to the letter, rendering a detailed examination unnecessary, and thus augments the force of its evidence.

Last but not the least to note is the description of Naimiśāranya given in the opening verses of the Vaiśyacarita of the Sanatsujātasamhitā in Skanda Uttara Khaṇḍa.⁸¹ The sacred forest is described here as resounding with the chanting of Mantras by gatherings of Maharṣis, auspicious with trees bearing flowers and situated across the waters of the Sarasvatī which agrees with its location in the doab of the rivers Sarasvatī and Dṛṣadvatī.

An examination of relevant evidence from various classes of Sanskrit literature, including the Samhitās, the Brāhmaṇas, the Upaniṣadas, the Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas, thus leads to the conclusion that Naimiśa was the name of a district and its people in ancient Kurukṣetra. It was mostly covered with wild growth and dotted with hermitages. It was located along the bank of the Dṛṣadvatī and extended towards the Sarasvatī so as to comprise the lower part of the Sarasvatī-Dṛṣadvatī doab which was called Brahmāvarta.⁸² We have seen that well-known personalities of Kurukṣetra are associated with Naimiśa also, same rivers are connected with both the regions and there are situations which can be reconciled only with the equation of Gomatī with Dṛṣadvatī and the location of Naimiśa within the limits of Kurukṣetra. And finally we have cited texts which directly confirm this fact.

However, we do not rule out the possibility that in course of time the name Naimiśa or Naimiśāranya travelled eastward, leaving its vestiges in names like Naimiśakuñja in Kurukṣetra and Nimsar or Nimkharvan in Uttar Pradesh.

79. i.2.12.

80. See 1.17 & 160; 2.9. ff. & 2.13 etc.

81. A Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Mss. In the Govt. Oriental Mss. Library, Madras, Vol. IV, Madras 1908, p. 1843, No. 2542. Beg.


82. Manusmṛti ii. 17.

Shri ANAND SWARUP GUPTA

Indologists in general and scholars of Purāṇic Studies in particular were shocked to learn of the demise of Shri Anand Swarup Gupta, Asstt Director and Editor-in-charge of the Purāṇa Department of the All-India Kashiraj Trust on the afternoon of October 14, 1981, at his residence in Ramnagar, Vārāṇasī. Shri Gupta was so closely associated with and involved in the Purāṇa project of the Trust that it will be a difficult task for the Trust to arrange and prosecute its project properly in his absence. He was associated with the project from its very inception, first as an assistant and then as editor-in-chief. He ably and with wide appreciation from all corners of the literary world critically edited three Mahāpurāṇas—Vāmana, Kūrma and Varāha—published by the Trust. He also edited the Purāṇa Bulletin for the last twenty years and contributed scholarly articles and notes to the Bulletin (A list of his works is appended below). He attended several sessions of the Oriental Conference and contributed papers there. He also delivered extension lectures at many Research Centres and Institutes. He taught Sanskrit and Hindi to post-graduate classes of Meerut (then Agra) University before joining the All-India Kashiraj Trust, and edited many text books. In short, his academic activities were extended to various fields. He also served as an Āyurvedic physician in his early days.

Shri Gupta was born on 4th April, 1905 in the village Aurangabad (Rasulpur), six miles from Meerut city in the Agrawala family. He was the only son of his father Lala Banshidhar. He passed the B.A. examination in 1927 from Allahabad University and M.A. (Sanskrit) from Agra University (1929). Later he took also Master Degree in Hindi and History from the same University.

Shri Gupta was an unassuming scholar with pleasing and genial personality. He had the depth and solidity of traditional learning. He had a very accurate knowledge of Pāṇinian grammar. Being originally an Ārya Samājist, he had a good knowledge of Vedic literature. He daily recited the *Gītā* and *Upaniṣads*. Besides his wide knowledge he possessed a rare personality filled with love,



Shri Anand Swarup Gupta

affection and regard for all and with malice to none. Nobody, whether superior or subordinate, coming in contact with him ever felt any discomfiture from him; likewise he also never bore any grudge to any one. In this connection we may recall a verse of the *Gītā* (12.15) in which such a person is called a Yogin :

यस्मान्नोद्विजते लोको लोकान्नोद्विजते च यः ।

Though he was always in poor health he never hesitated to do hard work. He used to come to the office around 12 noon but till 5p.m. he never left his chair, and indulged only in serious academic work. During these five hours he always engaged himself in ticklish problems of Purāṇic texts. He set an example to his colleagues and subordinates for hard work. Sometimes he was so much engrossed in these texts that he failed to notice even the arrival of scholars, who used to sit by his side. He was later informed by the colleagues about the guests. He always cherished the Vedic idea of doing work till the last moment :

कुर्वन्नेवेह कर्माणि जिजीविषेच्छतं समाः ।

Shri Gupta was always helpful to friends and colleagues. There is hardly any instance when he dealt roughly with his co-workers. He always tried to help and guide us in academic matters. We have perfect trust in the words of the Blessed Lord :

न हि कल्याणकृत् कश्चिद् दुर्गतिं तात गच्छति (Gītā 6.40)

Shri Gupta was a disciplined scholar and maintained a daily diary of his work. He always advised the scholars to maintain a record of their works. He was very punctual for the office routine and he never liked that a person should leave the office before time. In his last days His Highness Maharaja Dr Vibhuti Narain Singh, Chairman of the Trust, kindly permitted him to carry on his work at his residence. Even in that condition any visitor was amazed to see that Shri Gupta was always engrossed in Purāṇic work. Actually he had no interest except in the work of study (विद्यारत). Shri Gupta had good contacts with eminent scholars like Dr Kane, Dr Suniti Kumar Chatterjee, Dr Mirashi, Dr Agrawala, Dr Raghavan, Dr Pusalker, Dr Hazra and many others. All of them had high regard and appreciation for his scholarship and unassuming personality. Dr V. S. Agrawala used to say that Śrī Gupta was the chief gem of the crown.

Hearing the news of his death M.M. Dr Mirashi expressed his sorrow in the following words : 'We have lost a devoted Scholar of the Purāṇas'. Dr. Hazra said : 'The news of Śrī Gupta's unexpected death is to me a bolt from the blue. He was a very sincere and affectionate friend of mine and it is extremely painful for me to think that he is far beyond my reach and will never return'.

Shri Gupta was originally an Ārya Samājist, but on account of his association with the Purāṇa work he developed a high regard for the Purāṇas. He firmly held that the Purāṇas are the '*upabr̥hmaṇa*' or amplification of the Vedas. Besides the *Gītā* and *Upaniṣads* he also used to recite the *Viṣṇusahasranāma* of the Mahābhārata. A few months before his death when I enquired about his recitation of the *Viṣṇusahasranāma* he replied that then he recited only selected names from it. Probably his argument was that since these names were expressive of attributes (गुण) he would recite only those names which then appealed to him. It is very fortunate that Shri Gupta did not lose his senses till his last breath. In the last five days before his death he bade farewell to his relatives with folded hands.

For the critical edition of Purāṇas Shri Gupta did his best to make them as authentic and reliable as possible. In 1959 he spent six months in Madras with Dr V. Raghavan for the critical edition of the Matsya Purāṇa and the Purāṇa Bulletin. Later he spent a few months in Poona at the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute to see the finer points of the Critical Edition of the Mahābhārata under Dr Dandekar. He was also in contact with the Rāmāyaṇa project of Baroda University. Here in the Purāṇa Deptt. also he discussed the text with his colleagues and other eminent Pandits and scholars like Pt. Rajeshwar Shastri Dravid, Hare Ram Shukla, Dr R. K. Sharma, Dr. S. N. Shastri and others. Shri Gupta had very high esteem and regard for H. H. Maharaja Dr Vibhuti Narain Singh. He always tried his best to fulfil the commands and wishes of H. H. the Maharaja.

H. H. Maharaja Dr. Vibhuti Narain Singh has very high appreciation for his erudition and scholarship. Maharaj Bahadur firmly holds the opinion that Shri Gupta was not inferior to any eminent scholar and with this sense of appreciation and confidence he authorised him to edit the critical editions of the Mahāpurāṇas in the place of Dr V. S. Agrawala.

Shri Gupta efficiently edited the three Mahāpurāṇas with distinction and showed himself worthy of the confidence reposed in him by the Maharaja. He was a pioneer in the field of critically editing the Mahāpurāṇas—an eminent pathmaker (पथिकृत् विद्वान्). At the Silver Jubilee function of the Trust on 24 October, 1981, H. H. Maharaja paid a glowing tribute to Shri Gupta, a tribute fully shared by all Purāṇic scholars.

We pray in the words of Upaniṣads—may the Almighty grant the departed soul union with himself :

यस्तूर्णनाभ इव तन्तुभिः प्रधानजैः स्वभावतो देव एकः स्वमावृणोत् । स नो
दधाद् ब्रह्माप्ययम् ॥

—Śvetāśvatara Up. VI. 10

‘May the effulgent Being, the One without a second, who, like a spider, spontaneously covers Himself with threads made out of His own creative powers, grant us union with himself, the Brahman.’

—Ganga Sagar Rai

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

Articles in the Purāṇa

	Vol. & pp.
1. A study of the Textual Peculiarities of a Śārada Ms. of the Matsya-Purāṇa —also in XX Session of A. I. O. C. 1959 Bhubuneswar	I. 58- 71
2. The manuscripts of the Matsya Purāṇa collated for its projected critical edition	I. 101-111
3. Devanāgarī-Source of the Ujjain—Śārada Ms. of the Matsya Purāṇa	I. 163-174
4. Study of a newly acquired Śārada Ms. of the Matsya Purāṇa	II. 120-127
5. The apocryphal character of the extant Brahma-Vaivarta Purāṇa	III. 92-101
6. Conception of Sarasvatī in the Purāṇas	IV. 55-95

7. Purāṇeṣvapaṇīya-prayogāḥ	IV. 277-297
8. The Kashmirian version of the Matsya Purāṇa	V. 333-345
9. On the adhyāyas of the Vāmana Purāṇa	V. 360-366
10. The stotras in the Matsya Purāṇa; an analysis	I. 156-159
11. Bibliographical Notes	I. 246-249
12. Textual Notes	III. 331-332
13. Bibliographical Notes	V. 182-185
14. Book Review (of Dr. Agrawal's Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa--Ek Adhyayana)	IV. 225-227
15. Obituary of B. Hermaum	III. 296
16. The problem of interpretation of Purāṇas	VI. 53-78
17. Purāṇa, Itihāsa and Ākhyāna	VI. 451-461
18. Purāṇas and their referencing	VII. 321-351
19. Book-Review ; Planets and stars by Dr. Sampūrṇānand	VII. 188-191
20. Constitution of the Vāmana Purāṇa Text	IX. 141-194
21. In Memoriam : Dr. V. S. Agrawal	IX. 197-201
22. The glorification of Vyāsa	IX. 217-221
23. The glorification of Vyāsa	X. 109-112
24. Books recieved : short notes on their contents	XI. 2 1-2
25. Purāṇic theory of yugas and kalpas	XI. 2 304-323
26. Does the Vāmana Purāṇa mention Tulasi?	XII. 1 149-151
27. No omission in the Vāmana Purāṇa of the text relating to gifts for Viṣṇu's worship in Śrāvaṇa	XII. 1 152
28. A note on Sylwan Levi's interpretation of 'Tato Jayamudiryet'	XII. 1 153-155
29. A Note on the mention of spouse and progeny of Vāmana in the Bhāgavata	XII. 1 174-177

30. Sūcipatra or contents of the Vāmana-Purāṇa from the Kashmirian MS कारा,
[with notes] XII. 1
31. A Problem of Purāṇic text reconstruction XII. 2 304-321
32. Book-Reviews XIV. 1 70-76
33. Problem of the extent of the Kūrma-Purāṇa XIV. 2 125-136
34. Book Reviews XV. 2 144-147
35. Obituary : Dr. A. D. Pusalker XVI. 1 115
36. Book-Review XVI. 2 261
37. Obituary : Dr. Norman W. Brown XVII. 2 190-191
38. Purāṇic Heritage XVIII. 1 39-55
39. A Note on lunar months as named on Viṣṇu's twelve names XIX. 2 351-353
40. Books received (with brief note on their contents) XX. 1 139-141
41. Vasudeva śānti prayer for the prosperity of a rāṣṭra XX. 2 161-168

[Besides these Shri Gupta edited with notes a good number of *stotras*, which were published in different issues of the Purāṇa.]

Articles in other Journals

1. भारतीय संस्कृति के प्रतीक-भगवान् श्रीकृष्ण— कल्याण अक्टूबर 1961
2. दाराशिकोह के गुरु-कवीन्द्राचार्य सरस्वती— विश्वज्योति जनवरी 1972
3. The Śāṅkhya Yoga of the Bhāgavata Gīta—
हिन्दुत्व जनवरी 1974
4. भगवत्कृपा की अमिष्यक्ति— कल्याण भगवत्कृपा अक्टूबर 1974
5. बराहपुराण के ग्रन्थपरिमाण की समस्या—
कल्याण बराहपुराण अक्टूबर 1977
6. Which God should we worship with our oblations—
हिन्दुत्व August 1977

7. सती तथा सतीप्रथा— स्मारिका 1978
8. महाराजा अग्रसेन की ऐतिहासिकता पर विचार—
अग्रवाल संदेश मई 1978
9. महाराजा अग्रसेन की ऐतिहासिकता पर विचार—
अग्रवाल संदेश सितम्बर 1968
10. महाराजा अग्रसेन की सत्ता का भावात्मक पक्ष—
अग्रवाल संदेश जनवरी 1979
11. South Indian version of the Varāha Purāṇa—
Ludwick Sternback Felicitation Volume Dec. 1979
12. Purush-Yajña in theory & practice—
विश्व हिन्दुधर्मसम्मेलन 1978
(Souvenir Volume)
13. सौपर्ण साम—सामवेद का एक महत्त्वपूर्ण साम— सविता सुपर्णांक 1973
14. Bhagavān Krishna—the symbol of our Culture—
Souvenir Anniversary Celebration Nor— November 1959
15. The Problem of Interpretation of the Purāṇas—
Twenty-sixth Congress of Orientalists 1964
16. संस्कृत और उसका अध्ययन— 'भाषा' जून 1964
सम्राट् शाहजहाँ के समकालीन काशी के एक विद्वान्—
'सरस्वती' मार्च 1963
17. Textual criticism in Sanskrit Literature—
'भारती' Nos. 12-14
18. सिद्धीनां विवेचनं-पुराणोक्त निदर्शनं च— सारस्वती सुषमा—सं० 2022
19. सर्वोदय के प्राण बापू— साप्ताहिक हिन्दुस्तान ८ मार्च 1953
20. The place of Śūta in the Purāṇic tradition
A. I. O. C. XXI session 1961 Srinagar.
21. Textual Problem of the Vāmana Purāṇa—A.I.O.C.
XXIV Session 1968 Varanasi
22. A study of the grammatical aberrations
in the Vāmana Purāṇa
23. पुराणवाङ्मय तथा उसकी देन

Books edited and translated

1. उत्तररामचरित नाटक की संस्कृत टीका तथा हिन्दी अनुवाद—
प्रकाशक—मोतीलाल बनारसीदास
2. सुगम संस्कृत व्याकरण—
प्रकाशक—मोतीलाल बनारसीदास
3. व्युत्पत्त्यात्मक संस्कृत हिन्दी कोश (अप्रकाशित)—मोतीलाल बनारसीदास
4. कुसुमावली का सम्पादन—प्रकाशक—भारत भारती प्रकाशन, मेरठ
5. रत्नावली—प्रकाशक—मोतीलाल बनारसीदास
6. चन्द्रापीडकथा—Explanation with Grammatical notes
प्रकाशक—जयप्रकाश नाथ एण्ड को०, मेरठ
7. हर्षचरितसार " " "
8. वामनपुराण का सम्पादन
9. कूर्मपुराण "
10. वराहपुराण "

ACTIVITIES OF THE ALL-INDIA KASHIRAJ TRUST

(July-December, 1981)

Varāha Purāṇa Work

The editing and printing of the critical edition and English translation of the Varāha Purāṇa have been completed. The 215 *adhyāya-s* with their critical apparatus, introduction and appendices have been published in one volume. The Sanskrit text as established in the critical edition and its English translation have also been edited, printed and published in a separate volume. The two volumes were released and presented to the President of the International Association of Sanskrit Studies at a function held at Shivala Palace on the 24 of October, 1981, during the Vth World Sanskrit Conference (see details below).

Viṣṇusahasranāma Work

The collation of the MSS of the Viṣṇusahasranāma has been continued. It will include the Viṣṇusahasranāma of the Mahābhārata, Padma, Garuḍa and Skanda Purāṇa-s. MSS of the Mahābhārata and Padma have been collated. Mss of the Garuḍa and Skanda have already been asked from different libraries in India and abroad.

Garuḍa Purāṇa Work

The collation of four MSS of the Garuḍa Purāṇa is being completed. Of these four, two MSS belong to the Sarasvatī Bhaṇḍār, Rāmnaṅgar, and two MSS to the Bhandarkara Oriental Research Institute of Poona. All four MSS are in Devanāgarī. Other MSS have been ordered from W. Germany, Allahabad and Calcutta. Śrī Ranbir Sanskrit Research Institute, Śrī Raghunath Mandir, Jammu, is at present the only library having complete MSS of the Brahmakhaṇḍa or the third part of the Garuḍa Purāṇa.

Editing of Premrāmāyaṇa

The Prema Rāmāyaṇa of Ramu Dvivedi has been critically edited by Maharaj Kumari Krishnapriya on the basis of two MSS. The book was presented to Dr. Dandekar, the President of the International Association of Sanskrit Studies, at a special function held at Tulsī Ghāṭ on 24.10.1981 in the presence of the delegates to the Vth World Sanskrit Conference. The Prema Rāmāyaṇa is a translation and rifacimento in Sanskrit of Tulsī-dāsa's Rāmacaritmānasa, Ayodhyā Kāṇḍa. It has about 2200 śloka-s.

सर्वभारतीय-काशिराजन्यासस्य कार्यविवरणम्

(जुलाई-दिसम्बर १९८१)

वराहपुराणसम्बन्धि कार्यम्

वराहपुराणस्य पाठसमीक्षितसंस्करणस्य आंग्लभाषानुवादस्य च संपादन-कार्यं मुद्रणकार्यं च पूर्णतां गतम् । पाठसमीक्षित-संस्करणस्य पञ्चदशाधिक-द्विशताध्यायास्तेषां पाठान्तरविवरणं भूमिका, परिशिष्टानि च एकस्मिन् भागे प्रकाशितानि । द्वितीये भागे पाठसमीक्षितसंस्करणे मुद्रिता मूलश्लोकास्तेषाम् आंग्लभाषानुवादश्च भूमिकापरिशिष्टादिभिः सह प्रकाशिताः । उभावपि भागौ पञ्चमविश्वसंस्कृतसम्मेलनावसरे सर्वभारतीय-काशिराजन्यासस्य रजत-जयन्त्युत्सवे २४ अक्टूबर १९८१ दिनाङ्के शिवालाभवने सम्मेलनाध्यक्षेण उद्घाटितौ । तौ च भागौ सम्मेलनाध्यक्षाय समर्पितौ । (रजतजयन्त्युत्सवस्य विवरणमुपरिष्ठाद् द्रष्टव्यम्)

विष्णुसहस्रनामसंबन्धि कार्यम्

विष्णुसहस्रनामस्तोत्रस्य पाठसंवादकार्यं प्रचलति । अस्मिन् संपाद्यमाने ग्रन्थे पद्म-स्कन्द-गरुडपुराणेषु महाभारते चोपलब्धानि विष्णुसहस्रनामस्तोत्राणि भविष्यन्ति । सम्प्रति महाभारतस्य पद्मपुराणस्य च हस्तलेखानां पाठसंवाद-लेखनकार्यं कृतम् । गरुडपुराणस्य स्कन्दपुराणस्य च हस्तलेखानामवाप्तये प्रयासः क्रियते; हस्तलेखप्रदानाय केचन ग्रन्थागाराध्यक्षा अनुरुद्धाः ।

गरुडपुराणसंबन्धि कार्यम्

गरुडपुराणस्य चतुर्णां हस्तलेखानां पाठसंवादलेखनकार्यम् प्रायेण समाप्तं जातम् । एषु चतुर्षु हस्तलेखेषु द्वौ रामनगरदुर्गस्थस्य सरस्वतीभण्डारपुस्तकालयस्य, द्वौ च पुणेनगरस्थस्य भण्डारकरप्राच्यशोधसंस्थानस्य, सन्ति । चत्वारो हस्तलेखा देवनागरीलिपिमयाः । प्रयागनगरात् पश्चिमजर्मनीदेशान्च हस्तलेखानां प्राप्तये प्रयासो विहितः । जम्मूनगरस्थरघुनाथपुस्तकालये गरुडपुराण-तृतीय-खण्डस्य ब्रह्मखण्डनामकस्य हस्तलेखो वर्तते ।

प्रेमरामायणस्य प्रकाशनम्

रामूद्विवेदविरचितं प्रेमरामायणं हस्तलेखानामाधारेण कनिष्ठया महा-राजकुमार्या श्रीमत्या कृष्णप्रियया संपादितम् । इदं संस्करणं पञ्चमविश्वसंस्कृत-सम्मेलनस्य प्रतिनिधीनामुपस्थितौ तुलसीघट्टे २४-१०-८१ दिनाङ्के सायंसमये सम्मेलनस्याध्यक्षाय डा० दाण्डेकरमहोदयाय समर्पितम् । प्रेमरामायणं खलु तुलसी-दासविरचितस्य रामचरितमानस (अवधीभाषामय)स्यायोध्याकाण्डस्य संस्कृत-भाषामयो पद्यबद्धा टीका स्वतन्त्रग्रन्थरूपा । ग्रन्थोऽयं प्रायेण २२०० पद्येषु निर्मितः ।

Purāṇa Goṣṭhī

The Vyāsa Pūrṇimā celebration was held under the Chairmanship of Mahārāja Dr. Vibhuti Narain Singh, Kashinaresh, at Shivala Palace of the All-India Kashiraj Trust on 16.7.1981. In the beginning 20 Vedic Brāhmaṇas recited Vasant Puja, parts of the Vedas. Later two South Indian girls recited verses from the Saundarya Laharī and Lalitā Sahasranāma. The Mahārāja Kumār Śrī Anant Narain Singh distributed Dakṣiṇā to Vedic Brāhmaṇas. Later, a Purāṇa Seminar or Goṣṭhī was held, in which after Maṅgalācaraṇa Dr. Ganga Sagar Rai of the Trust presented the annual working report of the Purāṇa Department. The Critical Edition of the Varāha Purāṇa, was also presented to the Mahārāja Dr. Vibhuti Narain Singh by Dr. Ganga Sagar Rai. The Mahārāja told the scholars about the coming Silver Jubilee of the All-India Kashiraj Trust and asked the scholars to suggest the manner in which it should be celebrated. He also informed the scholars about the Vth World Sanskrit Conference and sought their active co-operation. Discussion started and the scholars expressed their views. Among the prominent scholars who expressed their views were Pt. Baladeva Upadhyāya, Dr. Raghunath Singh, former Chairman of the Shipping Corporation, Prof. Lallanji Gopal, Prof. Rewa Prasad Dwivedi, Prof. Vishwanath Bhattacharya, Prof. Vishwanath Shastri Datar and Śrī Vaikuṇṭha Nath Upadhyaya. The Mahārāja thanked the scholars. At the end prasāda and tea were served to the scholars.

Purāṇa Pāṭha

The Tripurā Rahasya Mahātmya Khaṇḍa was recited in the Bālā Tripura Sundarī temple Ratna Bāg from Āṣāḍha Śukla Pratipad to Navamī (i. e. July 2 to 11). The reciter was Śrī Kāmadeva Jhā.

A solemn 'Bhāgavata Saptāha' was held in the Jawahir khana of the Ramnagar Fort, from 16 November to 25 November, 1981. After a *yajña* at the opening of the week-long recitation the Bhāgavata purāṇa was recited according to the prescribed ritual in the mornings by Śrī Viśvanāth Sastri Datar. In the evenings discourses were given by Śrī Viśvanātha Sastri Datar. H. H. the Mahārāja together with the Mahārāja Kumār and the Mahārāja Kumārīs attended regularly to all the rituals. People in great number were present at the discourses every day. On the final day a *yajña* was performed, Brāhmaṇas were fed and due Dakṣiṇā was given to their.

पुराण-गोष्ठी

तत्रभवतां काशिनरेशानां डा० विभूतिनारायणसिंह-महोदयानां सभा-पतित्वे १६-७-८१ दिनाङ्के व्यासोत्सवः सम्पन्नः । प्रारम्भे वैदिकी वसन्तपूजा सम्पन्ना, यस्यां विशतिर्वेदज्ञा ब्राह्मणा वेदपाठमकुर्वन् । तदनन्तरं द्वे दक्षिणात्ये बालिके 'सौन्दर्यलहरीः' 'ललितासहस्रनाम्न'श्च केषांचिच्चलोकानां पाठमकुर्वताम् । महाराजकुमारः श्री अनन्तनारायणसिंहो ब्राह्मणेभ्यो दक्षिणां प्रदत्तवान् । एतदनन्तरं पुराणगोष्ठी प्रारब्धा । मङ्गलचरणानन्तरं डा० गंगासागररायः पुराणविभागस्य वार्षिकं कार्यविवरणं प्रस्तुतवान् । सद्यःप्रकाशितं वराह-पुराणस्य पाठसमीक्षितं संस्करणं न्यासाध्यक्षेभ्यः काशिनरेशेभ्यो महाराजेभ्यो डा० विभूतिनारायणसिंह-महोदयेभ्यः समर्पितं डा० गङ्गासागरराय-महोदयेन । तत्रभवन्तो महाराजा डा० विभूतिनारायणसिंह-महोदया उपस्थितान् विदुषो न्यासस्य भाविनो रजतजयन्त्युत्सवस्य सूचनां दत्तवन्तः, उत्सवस्य स्वरूपप्रकार-विषये विदुषश्च जिज्ञासितवन्तः । तैर्वाराणस्यां भाविनः पञ्चमविश्वसंस्कृत-सम्मेलनस्य सूचनापि प्रदत्ता, विदुषां सहयोगश्च काङ्क्षितः । तदनन्तरं विचारविमर्शः प्रारब्धः, विद्वांसः स्वस्वमतानि च प्रकाशितवन्तः । प्रमुखेषु वक्तृषु पं० बलदेव उपाध्यायः, डा० रघुनाथ सिंहः, प्रो० लल्लनजी गोपालः, प्रो० रेवा-प्रसाद द्विवेदी, प्रो० विश्वनाथ भट्टाचार्यः, पं० विश्वनाथशास्त्री दातारः, पं० वैकुण्ठनाथ उपाध्यायश्च आसन् । अन्ते महाराजैः धन्यवादो ज्ञापितः । प्रसाद-वितरणानन्तरमल्पाहारश्च प्रदत्तः ।

पुराणपाठः

आषाढमासस्य शुक्लप्रतिपत्तिथिमारभ्य नवमीं तिथिं यावद् रामनगरस्थे रत्नबागोद्याने बालात्रिपुरसुन्दरीमन्दिरे त्रिपुरारहस्यस्य पाठः श्री कामदेवज्ञा-महोदयेन कृतः ।

रामनगरदुर्गे जवाहिरखानास्थाने श्रीमद्भागवतमहापुराणस्य पाठः प्रवचनं च (सप्ताहपाठः) जातम् । सप्ताहपाठात् प्राक् विधिपूर्वकं तत्तद्देवतानां पूजनं कृत्वा पं० विश्वनाथशास्त्रिदातारमहोदयेन पाठः, अपराह्णसमये प्रवचनं च कृतम् । तत्रभवन्तो न्यासाध्यक्षाः महाराजा महाराजकुमारो महाराजकुमार्यः, राजपरिवारसदस्याश्च विधिपूर्वकं सप्ताहपारायणं प्रवचनं च श्रुतवन्तः । अयं सप्ताहयज्ञः १६.११.८१ दिनाङ्कात् प्रारभ्य सप्तदिनानि यावज्जातः । प्रतिदिनं प्रवचनेषु बहुसंख्यका जना उपस्थिता आसन् । पारायणसमाप्ती पूर्णाहुतियज्ञः सम्पन्नो जातः, ब्राह्मणाश्च भोजिताः, दक्षिणाश्च प्रदत्ताः ।

Veda-Pārāyaṇa

The text of the Kṛṣṇa Yajurveda i. e. Taittirīya Saṁhitā was recited from memory by Śrī Anjaneya Ghaṇapāthī, while Śrī Gaṇeśa Bhata Bapata was the Śrotā. The recitation was held in the Prabhu-Nārāyaṇeśvara Temple of the Shivāla Palace in Vārāṇasī from 2.7.81 to 5.8.1981. On the completion of the scheduled Pārāyaṇa the usual Dakṣiṇā was given to the Pārāyaṇa-kartā and the Śrotā.

Scholars and Distinguished Persons who visited the Purāṇa Deptt.

On the occasion of the Vth World Sanskrit Congress, held in Vārāṇasī, H. H. Mahārāja Dr. Vibhuti Narain Singh, Chairman of the All-India Kashiraj Trust, invited a group of foreign scholars interested in the Purāṇa-s to express their views and give their suggestions on the activities of the Trust. The meeting took place in the Palace of Ramnagar on 26.10.1981. The Scholars reached Ramnagar by the motorboat offered by Maharaja Banaras Vidya-mandir Trust. They were first shown the work of the Purāṇa Deptt and the difficulties of the work and their possible solution were explained. Then the scholars were invited to express their opinions and suggestions. After the meeting with the Chairman, Dr. Vibhuti Narain Singh, they were offered refreshment and tea. They returned to Vārāṇasī on the same motorboat. The names of these scholars along with their opinions about the work of the Dept. are give below :

1. Dr. N.R. Bhatt—Head of Sanskrit Deptt., French Institute of Indology—Pondicherry : "I am very happy to visit the Purāṇa Deptt. of the Kāśī Raj Trust and to understand the principles of the critical edition of the Purāṇas, the great treasures of Bhārata".

2. Miss Margarida de Lacerda—University of Lisbon, Portugal : "I am deeply impressed by the work done in the Purāṇa Department and I am thankful for having had the honour of being asked by His Highness the Maharaja of Banaras".

3. Mr. B. Dagens—Director, French Institute of Indology, Pondicherry : "I am very happy to be here a second time and to see that Varāha P. has been published. We were all waiting for it".

वेदपारायणम्

कृष्णयजुर्वेदीय-तैत्तिरीयसंहितायाः स्मरणपूर्वकं पारायणं (ग्रन्थमनवलोक्य) श्री आञ्जनेयशर्म-घनपाठिमहोदयेन कृतम् । श्रीगणेशभट्टबापट-महोदयः श्रोता आसीत् । एतत्पारायणं न्यासस्य शिवालाभवनस्थे प्रभुनारायणेश्वर-मन्दिरे २.७.८१ दिनाङ्कमारभ्य ५.८.८१ दिनाङ्कं यावत् संपन्नम् । पारायण-समाप्ती पारायणस्य कर्त्रे श्रीत्रे च विहिता दक्षिणा दत्ताः ।

पुराणविभागे आगता विशिष्टा जना विद्वांसश्च

वाराणस्यां सम्पन्ने पञ्चमविश्वसंस्कृतसम्मेलनावसरे सर्वभारतीयकाशि-राजन्यासस्याध्यक्षास्तत्रभवन्तः काशिनरेशाः डा० विभूतिनारायणसिंहमहोदयाः पुराणाध्ययने निरतान् काञ्चन वैदेशिकविदुषः रामनगरदुर्गे काशिराज-न्यासस्य कार्येषु विमर्शार्थमाहूतवन्तः । एषा विमर्शसभा २६.१०.८१ दिनाङ्के सम्पन्ना । विद्वांसो महाराजबनारसविद्यामन्दिरन्यासस्य 'मोटरबोट' इति नौकायानेन आगताः, तेभ्यः पुराणसंबन्धि कार्यस्य परिचयः प्रदत्तः । एतस्मिन् पुराणकार्येयत्काठिन्यं यच्च तस्य समाधानं तदुभयं व्याख्यातम् । तदनन्तरं विदुषां विचाराः परामर्शाश्च आहूताः । न्यासाध्यक्षैस्तत्रभवद्भिर्महाराजैः डा० विभूति-नारायणसिंहमहोदयैः सह विमर्शानन्तरं तेभ्यः 'चाय' पानीयम् अल्पाहारश्च प्रदत्तः । तदनन्तरंस्ते पुनः तेनैव नौकायानेन वाराणसीं प्रत्यागताः । एतेषां नामानि पुराणकार्ये विचाराश्च अधोनिर्दिष्टाः—

१. डा० एन० आर० भट्टमहोदयः—पाण्डिचेरीनगरस्थस्य 'फ्रेञ्च इंस्टी-ट्यूट आफ इण्डोलॉजी' इत्यस्य अध्यक्षः—“अहं काशीराजन्यासस्य पुराणविभागं दृष्ट्वा भारतस्य महतां, निधिभूतानां पुराणानां पाठसमीक्षितसंस्करणस्य सिद्धान्तान् चावगत्य अतीव प्रसन्नोऽस्मि” ।

२. मिस मार्गरेडा डे लासेर्ड—पोर्तुगालदेशस्थ-लिस्बन-विश्वविद्यालय-संबद्धा—“पुराणविभागे सम्पन्नेन कार्येण अहमतीव प्रभाविताऽस्मि; तथा तत्र-भवद्भिः काशिनरेशैः आहूता इत्येतदर्थमतीव कृतज्ञा” ।

३. मि० बी० डगेन्स—पाण्डिचेरीस्थितस्य फ्रेन्च इंस्टीट्यूट इत्यस्य निदेशकः—“अहमत्र द्वितीयवासरे आगत्य वराहपुराणस्य प्रकाशनं दृष्ट्वा अतीव प्रसन्नोऽस्मि” ।

4. Mr. A. Padoux—French National; Centre for Scientific Research, Paris: "My third visit to Purāṇa Department shows me the activities here ever increasing and so useful."

5. J. L. Bockington, Sanskrit Deptt., University of Edinburgh: "It was a real pleasure to view the work of the Putāṇa Dept. and to learn of the progress in this important field of work."

6. Dr. Thomas B. Coburn, St. Lawrence University, Canton, New York: "I am most grateful to have seen the inner working of an institution that is doing such invaluable work for Indological and comparative religious studies."

7. Miss H. Bruner, c/o French Institute of Indology Pondicherry.

8. G. Gispert-Sauch S. J.—Vidyajyoti, Delhi.

9. Prof. R. Panikkar—University of California, Santa Barbara, California.

10. Prof. Rocher and wife—University of Philadelphia.

On 31.12.1981 G. de la Lama, Ambassador of Mexico in Delhi, paid a visit to the Chairman, H. H. the Maharaja and to the Purāṇa Department. She writes in the visitors book: "We are very grateful to His Highness for all his attention and hope to contribute in any way at our disposal to his work for the Indian editions of the Purāṇa-s." The illustrious guest was later taken round the Museum,

Rāsa Līlā

The Rāsa līlā or enacting of Kṛṣṇa's dalliance at Vṛndāvana was performed in the Prasiddha Garden of Ramnagar from 3 to 15 August. The performance was undertaken under the auspices of the All-India Kashiraj Trust. For fifteen days many people attended with great enthusiasm and devotion the religious enacting. H. H. the Mahārāja Dr. Vibhuti Narain Singh also attended the performance daily.

Rāma Līlā

The Rāma Līlā, which is celebrated under the auspices of the All India Kashiraj Trust with the financial help of the Government of India, took place from Ananta Caturdaśī (23 September) to Āśvina Pūrṇimā (23 October). To attend the performance people come

४. मि० ए० पडुवस—पेरिस नगरस्थ-‘फ्रेन्च नेशनल सेण्टर फार साइ-
ण्टिफिक रिसर्च’ इत्याख्य-संस्थासंबद्धः—“अहमत्र पुराणविभागे तृतीयावसरे
आगत्य अत्रत्य कार्यजातं वृद्धिं गतं अतीवोपयोगि च पश्यामि” ।

५. मि० जे० एल० बाकिङ्गटन—एडिनवर्ग-विश्वविद्यालयीय-संस्कृत-
विभागस्थः—“पुराणविभागस्य कार्यावलोकनम् अस्मिन् उपयोगिनि कार्यक्षेत्रे
प्रगतिज्ञानं च वास्तविक आनन्द एव” ।

६. डा० थामस बी० कोबर्न—न्यूयार्क-अन्तर्गत-कैण्टन-स्थित-सेण्टलारेन्स-
विश्वविद्यालयीयः—“प्राच्यविद्यायास्तुलनात्मकधर्मस्य चातीवोपयोगि-सेवायां
संलग्नस्य अस्य संस्थानस्य आन्तरकार्यविधिं दृष्ट्वाऽहमतीवोपकृतोऽस्मि” ।

७. मिस० एच० ब्रुनर—पाण्डिचेरीनगरस्थ-फ्रेन्च संस्थानीया ।

८. जी० गिसपर्स साउच एस० जे०—विद्याज्योति-(दिल्ली) इतिस्थः ।

९. प्रो० आर० पनिक्कर—केलिफोर्निया विश्वविद्यालयीयः ।

१०. प्रो० रोचर सपत्नीकः—फिलाडेल्फिया-विश्वविद्यालयीयः ।

३१.११.८१ दिनाङ्के मेक्सिको देशस्य दिल्लीनगरस्थिता राजदूती मि०जी०
डे ला लामा महाशयाध्यक्षान् तत्रभवतः काशिनरेशान्, पुराणविभागं च दृष्टवती ।
एषा महाशया दर्शकपुस्तिकायां लिखति—“वयं काशिनरेशान् प्रति सद्भावनार्थं
कृतज्ञाः, आशास्महे च यत् पुराणानां भारतीयसंस्करणार्थं यथाशक्ति सहयोगं
कुर्मः” इति ।

रासलीला

कृष्णस्य रासलीलायाः प्रदर्शनं रामनगरस्थे प्रसिद्धोद्याने ३ अगस्त
दिनाङ्कत १५ अगस्त दिनाङ्कं यावत् संपन्नम् । रासलीलायाः प्रदर्शनं सर्वभारतीय-
काशिराजन्यासेन संचाल्यते । एतद् धार्मिकं प्रदर्शनं पञ्चदश दिनानि यावत्
प्रचलति, यस्य दर्शनं बहवो जना अत्युत्साहेन श्रद्धाभरितहृदयेन कुर्वन्ति ।
तत्रभवन्तः काशिनरेशा डा० विभूतिनारायणसिंह-महोदयाः प्रतिदिनं रास-
लीलाया अवलोकनं कुर्वन्ति ।

रामलीला

भारतशासनस्यार्थिकसाहाय्येन सर्वभारतीय-काशिराजन्यास-द्वारा
संचाल्यमाना रामलीला अनन्तचतुर्दशी-दिनं २३ सितम्बर आरभ्य आश्विन-शुक्ल-
पूर्णिमां २३ अक्टूबरयावत् संपन्ना जाता । लीलादर्शनार्थं काशीनगरतः समीपवर्ति-
स्थानेभ्यश्च जना आगच्छन्ति । नगरस्य मुख्यस्थानतः दर्शनार्थिनां गमनागमनाय
'वस' यानमागच्छति । साधवो बहव इतरे च जना मासं यावत् रामलीलादर्शनार्थं
रामनगरे एव वसन्ति । साधुभ्यः प्रतिदिनं निःशुल्कं भोजनं दीयते यदर्थं प्रति-

from the town and the neighbouring villages. Buses were arranged by the U. P. Roadways to transport them from and to the main points of the city. Sādhus and other people stayed in Ramnagar for the whole month. The sādhus got their free ration (*bhaṇḍārā*) every day. This year 23, 401 meals were distributed in the whole month. Some *Līlās* attracted more attention and crowds. On the *dasahar* day the Mahārāja, after the pūjā to the arms in the palace, proceeded in solemn procession on his elephant followed by more than a lac of people towards a place called Laṅkā where the enacting of the death of Rāvaṇa took place. The *Līlās* were performed from 5 P.M. to 10 or 11 P.M. The *Līlā* of the Rāma. Rājyābhiṣeka continued for the whole night and people attended the *ārati* which took place at early dawn. The Mahārāja, the Mahārāja Kumāra and dignitaries attended the performance every day on their elephants. At the end of the month the *svatūpas* (performers) were received by H. H. the Mahārāja, who gave them due respect and food along with the Dakṣiṇā.

The British High Commissioner and Prince Aṅjum Quder of Oudh were special guests who came to see the Dasahara and Bharat Milap.

The Silver Jubilee Celebrations of the Trust

The All-India Kashiraj Trust was established in the year 1956 and it was inaugurated by Dr. Rajendra Prasad, the then President of India. The Silver Jubilee function of the Trust was celebrated on 24th of October 1981, at Sivala Palace of the Trust at 3 p. m. amidst all the delegates of the Vth World Sanskrit Conference held at Vārāṇasī, in the Banaras Hindu University from Oct. 21 to 26. Besides the delegates of the Conference eminent scholars of Vārāṇasī, the Officers of the three local Universities, important dignitaries and officers of the city were present to behold the celebration. More than a thousand scholars were present. The function was presided over by Dr. R. N. Dandekar, Chairman of the Conference. On the dais were present H. H. the Mahārāja Dr. Vibhuti Narain Singh, Chairman of the Trust, Mahārāja Kumāra Dr. Raghubir Singh of Sitamai, Prof. Baladeva Upadhyaya, Dr. Raghunath Singh, all Trustees; Prof. Filliozat and Vice-Chairman of the Conference, Dr. G. Bongard-Levin of the Russian Delegation; Prof. Hara of Japan, one of the Vice-Presidents of the International Association of Sanskrit Studies; Prof. Dr. R. K. Sharma, Secretary of the Organizing Committee of the Conference and Director

दिनम् अन्नसत्रं ('भण्डारा इति') प्रचलति । अस्मिन् वर्षे प्रायशो नव शतानि (१००) साधूनां प्रतिदिनं भोजनमलभन्त । केषुचिद्दिनेषु साधूनां संख्या चतुर्दशशत- (१४००) मित्ता जाता । संपूर्णे मासे २३४०१ साधूनां कृते भोजनान्नं प्रदत्तम् । महाराजा प्रतिदिनं लीलाकाले तत्र उपस्थिता भवन्ति । विजयादशमीदिने दुर्गे शस्त्रपूजानन्तरं महाराजा हस्त्यारोहणं कृत्वा 'लङ्का'-नामकं स्थानं गच्छन्ति, यत्र रावणवधस्य लीला प्रदर्शिता भवति । अस्यां विशिष्टायां यात्रायां लक्षाधिका जना महाराजानामनुगमनं कुर्वन्ति । प्रतिदिनं रामलीला सायं पञ्चवादनकालतो रात्रौ दशवादनम् एकादशवादनं वा यावत् प्रचलति । रामराज्याभिषेकस्य लीला रात्रिपर्यन्तं प्रचलति । दर्शकाश्च अपरदिने प्रातः समये आरात्रिकं ('आरती' इति) पश्यन्ति । महाराजा महाराजकुमारः विशिष्टां जनाश्च प्रतिदिनं हस्त्यारोहणं कृत्वा लीलां पश्यन्ति । मासान्ते लीला-समाप्तौ महाराजाः पात्राणां ('स्वरूप' इति नाम्ना प्रथितानां) दुर्गे सत्कारं कुर्वन्ति, तेभ्यः भोजनं दक्षिणाश्च प्रददति ।

अस्मिन् वर्षे ब्रिटिश हाईकमिशनर महोदयः तथा अवधस्य नबाब इति प्रथितः प्रिन्स श्रीअन्जुम कुदरमहोदयः प्रमुखदर्शकौ आस्ताम् ।

सर्वभारतीय-काशीराजन्यासस्य रजतजयन्त्युत्सवः

सर्वभारतीय-काशीराजन्यासस्य विधिवत्स्थापनं १९५६ ई० वर्षे जातम् । तदानीन्तनेन राष्ट्रपतिना डा० राजेन्द्रप्रसाद-महाभागेन न्यासस्य शिवाला-प्रासादे विधिवदुद्घाटनं विहितम् । अस्य रजतजयन्त्युत्सवः २४ अक्टूबर १९८१ दिनाङ्के अपराह्णे त्रिवादनसमये शिवालाप्रासादे पञ्चमविश्वसंस्कृत-सम्मेलन-सम्बद्धानां समस्तप्रतिनिधीनां समक्षं संपन्नः । पञ्चमविश्वसंस्कृत-सम्मेलनं काशिकहिन्दुविश्वविद्यालये अक्टूबर-मासस्य २१ दिनाङ्कमारभ्य २६ दिनाङ्कं यावत् संपन्नम् । सम्मेलनस्य प्रतिनिधिभ्योऽतिरिक्ता नगरस्य विशिष्टा विद्वांसः, त्रयाणां विश्वविद्यालयानां पदाधिकारिणस्तथा विशिष्टा जनाः पदा-धिकारिणश्चोपस्थिता आसन् । सहस्राधिका विद्वांस उत्सवे समागताः । उत्सव-स्याध्यक्षतां पञ्चमविश्वसंस्कृतसम्मेलनस्याध्यक्षो डा० रामचन्द्रनारायण-दाण्डेकर-महोदयश्चकार । मञ्चे तत्रभवन्तः काशिनरेशा महाराजा डा० विभूति नारायणसिंह-महोदयाः, महाराजकुमारो डा० रघुवीरसिंह-महोदयः, प्रो० बलदेव उपाध्यायमहोदयः, डा० रघुनाथसिंहमहोदयः (सर्वे न्यासधारिणः), सम्मेलनस्यो-पाध्यक्षः फ्रान्सदेशीयः डा० फिलिओजा-महोदयः, रूसदेशीयसदस्यानां नेता डा० बोनगार्ड लेविन महोदयः, जापानदेशीय प्रो० डा० हारामहोदयः उपस्थिता आसन् । मञ्चे उपस्थितेषु विशिष्टजनेषु इमे मुख्याः—राष्ट्रीयसंस्कृतसंस्थानस्य निदेशकः पञ्चम-विश्वसंस्कृतसम्मेलनस्य संयोजकः सचिवश्च डा० रामकरण-शर्म-महोदयः, केन्द्रीयशिक्षामन्त्रालयस्य संस्कृतविषये सहायकपरामर्शदाता डा०

Rashtriya Sanskrit Sansthan, Dr. C. R. Swaminathan, Asstt. Educational Advisor (Skt.), Govt. of India, Dr. K. N. Udupa Rector, B. H. U., Prof. Badari Nath Sukla, former V. C. of Sanskrit University; and Maharaj Kumar A. N. Singh. The Proceedings started with Maṅgalācaraṇa by Śrī Gaṇeśvara Drāviḍa. Śrī Paṭṭābhirāma Sastri read a message from the Senior Śaṅkarācārya His Holiness Śrī Chandraśekharendra Sarasvatī Mahārāja of Kanchi Kamakoti Peetham which he had kindly sent of his own accord for this occasion. Later, His Highness Mahārāja Dr. Vibhuti Narain Singh informed the scholars of the sad demise of Śrī Ananda Swarup Gupta, editor of the Purāṇa Bulletin, on October 14, 1981. His Highness paid high tribute to the head and heart of the late Śrī Gupta. All persons stood in silence for two minutes and prayed for the peace of the soul of Śrī Gupta. Mahārāja Kumāra Dr. Raghubir Singh of Sitamau welcomed the scholars and pointed out some salient features of modern research. Prof. Baladeva Upādhyāya, another Trustee, gave a brief survey of the activities of the Trust during the last twenty-five years. Dr. R. N. Dandekar spoke about the high qualities of the Purāṇa work done by the All-India Kashiraj Trust and paid high tribute to H. H. Mahārāja Dr. Vibhuti Narain Singh, Chairman of the Trust, for his patronage and guidance of the Purāṇa project. Thereafter Dr. J. Filliozat spoke very highly about the Purāṇa publications of the Trust. Prof. Hara of Japan, Vice-President of the I. A. S. S., joined Prof. J. Filliozat in his appreciation of the critical editions of the Mahāpurāṇas. Dr. Filliozat released the critical edition and English Translation volumes of the Varāha Purāṇa. Mahārāja Dr. Vibhuti Narain Singh presented copies of the Varāha Purāṇa to Dr. R. N. Dandekar and Dr. J. Filliozat.

Dr. G. Bongard-Levin declared that the Russian delegation would present a set of Russian publications on Indology to H. H. Mahārāja Dr. Vibhuti Narain Singh, which was being brought from Russia. Mahārāja Dr. Vibhuti Narain Singh presented a set of publication of the Trust to the Russian delegation.

On this occasion the Mahārāja Dr. Vibhuti Narain Singh announced that the All-India Kashiraj Trust will give a prize of Rupees ten thousand after every three years for the best book on Purāṇic subject published in any language. Then, at the request of the Chairman, Dr. R. N. Dandekar presented shawls in recognition of their services to Dr. G. S. Rai, Dr. G. Bonazzoli, Śrī Hiramani Mishra, Śrī Vijaya Shankar Singh, Śrī Kripasindhu Sharma, who

सी०आर०स्वामीनाथन्महोदयः; सम्पूर्णनिन्दसंस्कृतविश्वविद्यालयस्य सेवा-निवृत्तः कुलपतिः पं० बदरीनाथशुक्लमहोदयः; काशिकहिन्दुविश्वविद्यालयस्य रेक्टर डा० के० एन० उडुप्पामहोदयः; महाराजकुमारः श्रीअनन्तनारायणसिंह-महोदयश्च ।

कार्यक्रमस्यारम्भे पं० गणेश्वरदाविडेन मङ्गलाचरणं कृतम् । पण्डित-पट्टाभिरामशास्त्रिमहोदयः काञ्चीपीठस्थ-वरिष्ठशंकराचार्यैः श्रीचन्द्रशेखर-सरस्वती-महाभागैः रजतजयन्त्युत्सवार्थं प्रेषितं संदेशमपठत् । तदनन्तरं महाराजैः काशिनरेशैः 'पुराण-पत्रिकासंपादकस्य श्री आनन्दस्वरूपगुप्त-महोदयस्य १४ अक्टूबर १९८१ दिनाङ्के निधनमभूदिति सूचना उपस्थितेभ्यो विद्वद्भ्यः प्रदत्ता । महाराजा श्री गुप्तमहोदयस्य कर्मनिष्ठाया व्यक्तित्वस्य च भूरिशः प्रशंसनं कृतवन्तः । सर्वे जना अस्य विदुषः स्मृतौ क्षणद्वयं मौनभावेन उदतिष्ठन् । महाराजकुमारो डा० रघुवीरसिंह-महोदयः अतिथीनां स्वागतं चकार । तेन आधुनिकशोधविषयेऽपि विचाराः प्रस्तुताः । प्रो० बलदेव उपाध्यायः सर्वभारतीय-काशिराजन्यासस्य पञ्चविंशतिवर्षव्यापिकाल-कृतस्य कार्यस्य विवरणमुपस्थापयामास । डा० आर० एन० दाण्डेकर-महाशयो न्यासस्य पुराणकार्यस्य च वैशिष्ट्यं महत्त्वं च प्रतिपादयामास ; पुराणसंशोधनकार्यस्य संरक्षणार्थं संचालनार्थं च न्यासाध्यक्षेभ्यः तत्रभवद्भ्यः काशिनरेशेभ्यो डा० विभूतिनारायणसिंहेभ्यो भूरिशो धन्यवादांश्च प्रदत्तवान् ।

तदनन्तरं फ्रान्सदेशीयः प्राध्यापकः सम्मेलनस्योपाध्यक्षः डा० फिलिओजा महोदयः पुराणसंशोधनकार्यस्य महत्त्वं प्रतिपादयन् न्यासकृत-पुराणप्रकाशनस्य प्रशंसनं कृतवान् । जापानदेशीयः प्राध्यापकः डा० हारा-महोदयो (यः सम्मेलनस्य अपर उपाध्यक्षः आसीत्) डा० फिलिओजा-महोदयस्य विचाराणां समर्थनं प्रशंसनं च कृतवान् । तदनन्तरं डा० फिलियोजा-महोदयो वराहपुराणस्य संशोधित-संस्करणस्य आंग्लभाषानुवादस्य च उद्घाटनं चकार । न्यासाध्यक्षास्तत्रभवन्तः काशिनरेशा डा० विभूतिनारायणसिंहमहोदया वराहपुराणस्य संशोधितसंस्करणम् आंग्लभाषानुवादं च डा० दाण्डेकर-महोदयाय, डा० फिलिओजा-महोदयाय च समर्पयामासुः । डा० जी० बोनगार्डलेविन-महोदयः सूचयामास यद् रूसदेशीय-प्रतिनिधिमण्डलं न्यासाध्यक्षेभ्यो महाराजकाशिनरेशेभ्यः रूसदेशे प्रकाशितान् प्राच्यविद्याग्रन्थान् समर्पयिष्यति । इमे ग्रन्था रूसदेशादानीयमाना वर्तन्ते । महाराजा डा० विभूतिनारायणसिंह-महोदया अपि रूसदेशीयप्रतिनिधिमण्डलाय न्यासेन प्रकाशितान् ग्रन्थान् उपहारस्वरूपेण प्रदत्तवन्तः । पुराणप्रकाशन-कर्मणि संलग्नानां विदुषां सत्कारः 'शाल' इति अङ्गवस्त्र-प्रदानेन कृतः ।

एतदवसरे न्यासाध्यक्षाणां महाराजानां डा० विभूतिनारायणसिंह-महोदयानामनुरोधेन डा० दाण्डेकर-महोदयः पुराणप्रकाशन-विभागस्य विद्वद्भ्यः (डा० गङ्गासागरराय-महोदयाय, डा० बोनजुली-महोदयाय, श्री हीरामणि-मिश्र-महोदयाय, श्रीविजयशंकरचौधरी-महोदयाय, श्री कृपासिन्धुशर्म-महोदयाय)

had worked hard in the preparation and publication of the Varāha Purāṇa and to Śrī A. B. Bhattacharya who had translated into English the text of the Varāha Purāṇa.

Dr. Raghunath Singh, a Trustee, thanked the guests for their attending the session and spoke eulogistically about the activities of the Trust. Later a concert of vocal and instrumental music was given by a party led by Pt. Sivakumar Shastri. In conclusion H.H. Mahārāja Dr. Vibhuti Narain Singh thanked the guests for their kind collaboration in the work of the Trust and for the trouble they had taken in attending the session.

Fifth World Sanskrit Conference

The Fifth World Sanskrit Conference was held in Banaras Hindu University, Vārāṇasī from October 21 to 26, 1981. H. H. Mahārāja Dr. Vibhuti Narain Singh, Chairman of Trust and Chancellor of the Banaras Hindu University, was elected Chairman of the reception committee. About one thousand scholars from different countries attended the Conference. On the 21st the Conference was inaugurated by Śrī Viswanath Pratap Singh, Chief Minister of U. P. The Mahārāja Dr. Vibhuti Narain Singh welcomed the guests in lucid Sanskrit verses (published elsewhere) which were translated into English also. Dr. R. N. Dandekar presided over the Conference. He described the salient features of Sanskrit researches in his speech. Dr. R. K. Sharma, Organizing Secretary, made a Sanskrit summary of the English speech of Dr. R. N. Dandekar. At the end Dr. R. K. Sharma thanked the guests.

The Conference continued for five days and scholars presented their papers in different sessions. Dr. G. Bonazzoli of the Purāṇa Department read his paper entitled 'Purāṇic Schemes' on 23.10.81. On the evening of each day some cultural programmes were organized for the entertainment of the scholars. Different organizations and individuals gave dinners and lunches to the delegates. One day (the 24th) of the conference was given to All-India Kashiraj Trust in which the Silver Jubilee function was celebrated at Sivala Palace of the Trust. Prema Rāmāyaṇa was released at Tulsi Ghat and a lunch to the delegates was given in the hotel Taj Ganges by the A.I.K. Trust. On the 26th of October a special convocation was held in the Banaras Hindu University in which H. H. Mahārāja Dr. Vibhuti Narain Singh, as Chancellor of the University, conferred

तथा आंग्लभाषानुवादकारिणे श्री महिभूषणभट्टाचार्य-महोदयाय च 'शाल' नाम-
कानि प्रावरणानि समर्पयामास । एतदवसरे सर्वभारतीयकाशिराजन्यासस्याध्यक्षा-
स्तत्रभवन्तः काशिनरेशा डा० विभूतिनारायणसिंह-महोदया उद्घोषितवन्तो
यत् सर्वभारतीय-काशिराजन्यासो दशसहस्ररूप्यकाणां पुरस्कारः सर्वोत्तमायपुराण-
विषयक-ग्रन्थाय (यया कयापि भाषया रचिताय) प्रदास्यति । तदनन्तरं डा० रघुनाथ-
सिंह-महोदयः समागतेभ्यो विद्वद्भ्यो धन्यवादान् वितीर्णवान् । तदनन्तरं पण्डित-
शिवकुमारशास्त्रि-महोदयस्य नेतृत्वे वाद्यगानस्य कार्यक्रमः संजातो यस्मिन्
अन्नपूर्णाष्टकस्य विश्वनाथाष्टकस्य च गानमतीव मनोह्लादि आसीत् । अन्ते
काशिनरेशा न्यासकार्ये सहयोगं दातुं श्रमपूर्वकागमनकारिभ्यो विद्वद्भ्यो धन्य-
वादान् प्रददुः ।

पञ्चमं विश्वसंस्कृतसम्मेलनम्

वाराणस्यां काशिक हिन्दूविश्वविद्यालये १९८१ वर्षीय-अक्टूबरमासस्य
२१तः २६ दिनाङ्कं यावत् पञ्चमं विश्वसंस्कृतसम्मेलनं संपन्नम् । न्यासाध्यक्षाः
काशिकहिन्दूविश्वविद्यालयस्य कुलाधिपतयः काशिनरेशास्तत्रभवन्तो महाराजा
डा० विभूतिनारायणसिंह-महोदयाः सम्मेलनस्य स्वागतसमितेरध्यक्षा निर्वाचिता
आसन् । प्रायशः सहस्रसंख्याका भारतीया वैदेशिकाश्च प्रतिनिधयः सम्मेलने
उपस्थिताः । सम्मेलनस्योद्घाटनमुत्तरप्रदेशस्य मुख्यमन्त्री श्री विश्वनाथप्रताप-
सिंह-महोदयश्चकार । महाराजा डा० विभूतिनारायणसिंह-महोदया उपस्थितानां
विदुषां स्वागतं सुललितैः संस्कृतपद्यैश्चकार येषामनुवादः आंग्लभाषायामपि
श्रावितः (एतद्भाषणमुपरिष्ठान्मुद्रितमस्ति) । डा० दाण्डेकर-महोदयः सम्मेलन-
स्याध्यक्षतां चकार । तेन स्वभाषणे संस्कृतानुसंधानविषये केचन महत्त्वपूर्णाः
प्रश्नाः समुपस्थापिताः । सम्मेलनस्य संयोजक-सचिवः डा० रामकरण-
शर्म-महोदयः डा० दाण्डेकर-महोदयेन आंग्लभाषायां प्रदत्तस्याभिभाषणस्य
देववाण्यां सारसंक्षेपं श्रावयामास । उद्घाटनसमारोहसमापनावसरे डा०
रामकरण-शर्म-महोदयः सर्वेभ्यो धन्यवादान् वितीर्णवान् ।

सम्मेलनं पञ्चदिनव्यापि आसीत् । विद्वांसो विविधगोष्ठीषु स्वस्व-
निबन्धान् अपठन् । पुराणविभागस्थः डा० बोनाजुली-महाभागः 'पुराणगत-
विषय-क्रम'-विषये स्वनिबन्धमपठत् । प्रतिदिनं सन्ध्यासु प्रतिनिधीनां मनोरञ्जनार्थं
सांस्कृतिकः कार्यक्रमो विधीयमान आसीत् । विविधसंस्थाभिः जनैश्च प्रतिनिधीनां
कृते भोजनस्य व्यवस्था कृता । २४ अक्टूबर १९८१ दिनाङ्के सर्वभारतीय-
काशिराजन्यासेन प्रतिनिधिभ्यो 'ताजगङ्गेज'-होटल-संस्थाने भोजनं प्रदत्तम्;
यदनन्तरं तस्मिन्नेव दिने न्यासस्य रजतजयन्त्युसवः शिवालाभवने आयोजितः ।
तदनन्तरं च प्रेमरामायणस्य प्रकाशनोद्घाटनं तुलसीघट्टे संपन्नम् । २६ अक्टूबर
१९८१ दिनाङ्के काशिकहिन्दूविश्वविद्यालये तत्रभवतां महाराजानां विदुष-

the Degree of Doctor of Letters on eight Sanskrit scholars, three from foreign countries and five from India. Their names are—Dr. Paul Thieme, Dr. Jean Filliozat, Dr. J. Gonda, Dr. R. N. Dandekar, Dr. Raghunath Sharma, Dr. Charu Deva Shastri, Dr. Lakshmanjoo and Dr. Ramji Upadhyaya.

After the convocation the Valedictory function of the conference started. Mahārāja Dr. Vibhuti Narain Singh thanked the delegates for their active participation. He also declared the institution of a prize of Rs. ten thousand on Purāṇic work in any language every three years. Dr. Dandekar, Dr. Hard and Śrī Vishwanarayan Shastri expressed their views. Dr. Dandekar read out the resolutions passed in the conference. The Publication of the Varāha Purāṇa and the institutions of a prize of Rs. ten thousand for the best Purāṇic work were praised in the following resolutions :

1. The Fifth World Sanskrit Conference congratulates the Kashiraj Trust on the publication of the Critical Edition of the *Varāha Purāṇa* (with English translation) and expresses the hope that the critical editions of the remaining *Purāṇas* will also be brought out in quick succession.

2. The Conference further notes with pleasure the announcement made by the Kashi Naresh on behalf of the Kashiraj Trust regarding the institution of a prize of Rs. 10,000/- to be awarded every third year for the best work relating to the *Purāṇas* published in any language and in any country.

Finally Dr. R. K. Sharma thanked the guests, organizers and all associated persons for attending the Conference. The Venue and the office bearers of the next session were declared. Dr. R. N. Dandekar, Chairman, on behalf of the Conference presented a medal to Mahārāja for his services for the promotion of Sanskrit. During the conference a brochure on the All-India Kashiraj Trust and a booklet on *Varāṇasī* were distributed to the delegates.

The Chairman of the Trust honoured in Sri Lanka

On March 28, 1981 the Kalyani Samagri Dharma Mahasāṅgha Sabha, the Supreme Sangha Council of Sri Lanka honoured H. H. Kashināresh Mahārāja Dr. Vibhuti Narain Singh by conferring the highest Degree of Vidyā Chakravartī. The Mahārāja could not attend the function in person and the Degree was awarded

विद्यालस्यकुलाधिपतीनां डा० विभूतिनारायणसिंह-महोदयानामध्यक्षतायां विशेष-दीक्षान्त-महोत्सवः संपन्नः, यस्मिन् महाराजैः अष्टभ्यो विद्वद्भ्यः [पञ्चभ्यो भारतीयेभ्यः, त्रिभ्यो वैदेशिकेभ्यश्च] डी० लिट् इति सम्मानितोपाधिः प्रदत्तः। सम्मानितविदुषां नामानि इमानि—डा० पाल श्रीमे, डा० जीन फिलिओजा, डा० जे० गोण्डा, डा० आर० एन० दाण्डेकर, डा० रघुनाथ शर्मा, डा० चारुदेव शास्त्री, डा० लक्ष्मण जू, डा० रामजी उपाध्याय।

दीक्षान्त-समारोहानन्तरं सम्मेलनस्य समापन-समारोहः प्रारब्धः। महाराजा डा० विभूतिनारायणसिंह-महोदयाः प्रतिनिधिभ्यो धन्यवादान् वितीर्णवन्तः। तैः 'प्रतित्रिवर्षं कयापि भाषया रचिताय सर्वोत्तम-पौराणिक-ग्रन्थाय दशसहस्ररूप्यकाणां पुरस्कारो न्यासेन प्रदेयः'—इति घोषणा कृता। डा० दाण्डेकर-महाभागः, डा० हार्ड-महोदयः श्री विश्वनारायण-शास्त्रिमहोदयश्च सम्मेलन-साफल्यार्थं धन्यवादान् वितीर्णवन्तः। डा० दाण्डेकर-महोदयः सम्मेलनेन स्वीकृतान् प्रस्तावान् पठितवान्। वराहपुराणस्य प्रकाशनम्, दश-सहस्ररूप्यकाणां पुरस्कारस्य संस्थापनं च सम्मेलनेन अधोनिदिष्टाभ्यां प्रस्तावाभ्यां प्रशंसितम्—

१. "पञ्चमं विश्वसंस्कृतसम्मेलनं वराह-पुराणस्य पाठसमीक्षात्मक-संस्करणस्य (आंग्लभाषानुवादेन सह) प्रकाशनार्थं काशिराजन्यासस्याभिनन्दनं करोति; आशास्ते च यद् अवशिष्टानां पुराणानामपि पाठसमीक्षात्मकानि संस्करणानि शीघ्रमेव प्रकाशितानि भविष्यन्ती"ति।

२. "सम्मेलनमिदम् 'कयापि भाषया विरचिताय श्रेष्ठाय पुराणविषयक-ग्रन्थाय प्रति-त्रिवर्षं दशसहस्ररूप्यकमितः पुरस्कारः काशिराजन्यासेन देयः' इति काशिनरेशैः कृताया घोषणायाः सहर्षमवधानं करोति" इति।

अन्ते डा० रामकरणशर्ममहोदयः सर्वेभ्यो धन्यवादान् ज्ञापयामास। सम्मेलनाध्यक्षो डा० दाण्डेकरमहोदयः काशिनरेशेभ्यो डा० विभूतिनारायणसिंह-महोदयेभ्यः संस्कृतसेवार्थं पदकं समर्पयामास। सम्मेलनावसरे न्यासेन कार्य-विवरणं परं पुस्तकं वाराणसी-नाम्नी पुस्तिका च वितीर्णा।

न्यासाध्यक्षा लङ्कादेशे सम्मानिताः

२८ मार्चं १९८१ दिनाङ्के लङ्कादेशस्य सर्वोच्चसंस्थया 'कल्याणी सामग्री धर्ममहासंघ सभा'-इति नाम्न्या महाराजैभ्यः काशिनरेशेभ्यो डा० विभूति-नारायणसिंहमहोदयेभ्यो 'विद्याचक्रवर्ती'-इति सम्मानोपाधिः प्रदत्तः।

in absentia. Speakers on this occasion appreciated the services of Mahārāja Dr Vibhuti Narain Singh to the cause of religious harmony. The speakers traced the history of Kashiraj in Buddhist and Pali literature. Later on, at a special function held in Sarnath the Degree was handed over to the Mahārāja by Dr Hari Narain, the then Vice-Chancellor of Banaras Hindu University.

Prime Minister visits the Fort

The Prime Minister, Mrs Indira Gandhi, visited the Fort of Ramnagar on 16.5.81. The illustrious guest came to Vārāṇasī and Vindhyācala. On her way to Vindhyācala she paid a short visit to the Fort and she was offered refreshments by H. H. Mahārāja Dr Vibhuti Narain Singh.

ACTIVITIES OF THE SISTER TRUSTS

Mahārāja Prabhu Narain Singh Physical Cultural Trust

On the occasion of the birthday of the Mahārāja Kumāra Anant Narain Singh, the usual sport competitions took place in the grounds adjacent to the Fort on December 1 and 2, 1981. Several schools took part in the competitions and the boys of the junior and primary schools took part in the different sports. Judges were Sri Ashok Kumar Singh, Sri S. C. Datta, Sri S. L. Dar, and Sri Karan Singh. Prizes were distributed by the Mahārāja Kumārīs. Sri S. L. Dar congratulated the participants and hoped for their better preparation next year. Sweetmeats and tea were served to the participants and workers on both the days.

MAHĀRĀJA BANARAS VIDYAMANDIR TRUST

Vedic Bālaka Vasanta Pūjā

The Vedic Bālaka Vasanta Pūjā was performed by sixteen Vedic students under 15 years of age from Vārāṇasī on 1st December, 1981. The pūjā was performed in the Devī mandir which is situated in the Fort of Ramnagar. On the completion of the ritual the usual Dakṣiṇā was given to them and a meal was provided for them.

Painting Competitions

1. On 3.12.1981 the students of the local schools took part in a painting-on-the-spot competition in the premises of the Vidyā-mandira Pāṭhaśālā. The boys and girls occupied every corner

महाराजास्तत्र उपस्थिता नासन् । उपाधिरनुपस्थितौ प्रदत्तः । महाराजानां धर्मसमभावस्य प्रशंसनं तत्र कृतम् । वक्तृभिः पालिबौद्धग्रन्थेषु काशिनरेशानामुल्लेखस्य विवरणं प्रदत्तम् । वर्तमाना महाराजा तस्यामेव शृङ्खलायां वर्तन्ते इत्यप्युक्तम् । अनन्तरम् एष उपाधिः सारनाथस्थाने कस्मिंश्चिद् उत्सवे काशिकहिन्दुविश्वविद्यालयस्य तदानीन्तनेन कुलपतिना डा० हरिनारायण-महोदयेन महाराजेभ्यः समर्पितः ।

प्रधानमन्त्रिणः रामनगरदुर्गे आगमनम्

प्रधानमन्त्रिणो श्रीमती इन्दिरागान्धी-महाभागा १६.५.८१ दिनाङ्के रामनगरदुर्गे समागता । एषा महाभागा वाराणस्या विन्ध्याचलस्थानं प्रति गता । विन्ध्याचलं गन्तुकामा सा कञ्चित् कालं रामनगर-दुर्गे तस्थौ । महाराजैः डा० विभूतिनारायणसिंह-महोदयैः साऽल्पाहारेण सम्मानिता ।

सहयोगिन्यासानां कार्यविवरणम्

महाराजा-प्रभुनारायणसिंह-फिजिकलकल्चरल-ट्रस्ट

महाराजकुमारस्य वर्धापनावसरे अनेन न्यासेन १९८१ वर्षस्य दिसम्बर-मासे १, २ दिनाङ्कयोः दुर्गस्य समीपवर्तिनि 'खन्दक' स्थाने क्रोडा-प्रतियोगिताया आयोजनं कृतमासीत् । अत्रत्यानां प्राथमिक-पाठशालानां माध्यमिक-पाठशालानां च छात्रा उत्साहेन अस्यां प्रतियोगितायां समाविष्टा बभूवुः । दुर्गस्य-विद्यामन्दिर-पाठशालायाः छात्रा अपि उत्साहभरितचेतसा अस्यां प्रतियोगितायां समाविष्टा आसन् । श्री अशोक कुमार सिंहः, श्री एस० सी० दत्तमहोदयः, श्री एस० एल० दरमहोदयः, श्री कर्णसिंहमहोदयश्च निर्णायका आसन् । महाराज-बलवन्तसिंह-महाविद्यालयस्य प्राचार्यः, अध्यापकाश्च समारोहस्य संचालने साहाय्यं कृतवन्तः । श्री शिवनन्दनलालदर-महोदयः प्रतियोगिविद्यालयेभ्यश्छात्रेभ्यश्च धन्यवादान् वितीर्णवान्, आगामिवर्षे अधिकपरिश्रमेण आगमनाय उत्साहितवाञ्छ । महाराजकुमारीभिः विजेतृभ्यः छात्रेभ्यः विद्यालयेभ्यश्च पुरस्काराः प्रदत्ताः ।

महाराजाबनारसविद्यामन्दिर-न्यास

वैदिकबालककृता वसन्तपूजा

वैदिकवसन्तपूजा ऊनपञ्चदशवर्षीयैः षोडशैर्वैदिकैः १९८१ वर्षस्य दिसम्बर-मासस्य प्रथम-दिनाङ्के रामनगरदुर्गस्थे देवीमन्दिरे संपन्ना । वसन्तपूजानन्तरं तेभ्यो दक्षिणा भोजनं च प्रदत्तम् ।

चित्रकला-प्रतियोगिता

३.१२.८१ दिनाङ्के अत्रत्यानां पाठशालानां छात्राः 'सद्यः चित्ररचना'-प्रतियोगितायां विद्यामन्दिरप्राङ्गणे समाविष्टा आसन् । सर्वे छात्रा अत्युत्साहेन

WELCOME ADDRESS BY H. H. MAHARAJA
Dr. VIBHUTI NARAIN SINGH, CHAIRMAN,
RECEPTION COMMITTEE OF THE Vth WORLD
SANSKRIT CONFERENCE

VICTORY TO LORD VIŚVANĀTHA

Victory to the Vedic Dharma followed by all persons of highest achievement. Here shines its far-famed flag of victory reaching the highest sky. Victorious is the eternal voice of the Vedas, the goddess, which, though assuming various forms, is one in essence and is still inscrutable.

O You honourable scholars devoted to the protection of the Vedas and the scriptures, and you Indian friends concerned with Sanskrit, who follow them, and you who have come here to attend the Conference from far-off countries—we are happy to welcome you all, O lovers of Sanskrit.

Serve you the Sanskrit which provides to the people the highest knowledge that satisfies all the needs, provides spiritual knowledge and pure discrimination that brings about great joy, leads men to the path of deliverance drawing them away from the alluring path of enjoyment and delivers great bliss at all times.

Serve you the Sanskrit which nurtures noble feeling in the minds of men, encourages friendly feeling, advocates always the most pleasing conduct for the whole World, teaches good conduct approved by the scriptures and leads men always to the path of Dharma.

Serve you the Sanskrit which leads all men to the realisation of lofty ideals for their welfare by prescribing for them the standard conduct of the cultured, of the ruling kings and of noble men as to how the wicked are to be controlled, and the harmless ways of piety and teaches the useful scriptures.

Serve you the Sanskrit which inculcates in man the best and most beneficial spiritual knowledge, purifies the minds of the accomplished by imparting the knowledge of the Yoga Vidya, pleases the hearts of the scholars by the laudable teaching of the mantras and by means of the Tantric lore.

O You gentlemen, you have rendered a great service to humanity by willingly coming here at Kashi in this fifth World Sanskrit Conference. Really, if by your efforts the Vedic culture attains its permanent place of honour in this country, the Conference will be successful.

Happy and prosperous be the noble delegates who come to attend the Conference. We extend our respectful welcome to all the honourable participants.

“पञ्चमविश्वसंस्कृतसम्मेलनस्य स्वागतसमितेरध्यक्षाणां तत्र भवतां
काशिनरेशानां डा० विभूतिनारायणसिंह-महोदयानां स्वागताभिनन्दनम्”

॥ श्रीविश्वनाथो विजयते ॥

जयति सकलसिद्धैराश्रितः श्रौतधर्मः
स्फुरति गगनगामिन्यस्य सा वैजयन्ती ।
जयति भगवती सा नैकरूपैकरूपाऽ-
प्यविदितपद्मत्त्वा शाश्वती वेदवाणी ॥ १ ॥
श्रीमन्तः श्रुतिशास्त्ररक्षणपरा विद्वद्वरेण्या द्विजाः
सभ्याः संस्कृतचिन्तकास्तदनुगा ये भारतीया जनाः ।
ये राष्ट्रांतरतः सुदूरत इहाऽऽयाताश्च सम्मेलने
तेषां संस्कृतहादिनां सकुतुकं कुर्मः शुभं स्वागतम् ॥ २ ॥
विज्ञानं विपुलं जनेषु वितरत् सर्वार्थसंसाधकं
स्वाध्यात्मं विकिरद् विवेकममलं लोके महाह्लादम् ।
भोगासक्तिपथाद्वियोज्य गमयन्मुक्तेः सुमार्गे जनान्
कल्याणं बहुलं प्रकुर्वदनिशं संसेव्यतां संस्कृतम् ॥ ३ ॥
सौजन्यं जनतामनस्सु जनयत् सौहृद्यमुद्योतयत्
शीलं सङ्कलयन्नितान्तललितं विश्वेऽखिलं सर्वदा ।
वृत्तं शास्त्रसमर्थितं शुभकरं संशिक्षयन् मानवादं
मर्त्यान् धर्मपथं नयन् च नितरां संसेव्यतां संस्कृतम् ॥ ४ ॥
शिष्टानां व्यवहारनीतिमखिलां नीतिं धरित्रीपतेः
दुष्टानां दमनस्य नीतिममलां सद्धर्मनीतिं सताम् ।
सर्वानुच्चविचारवर्त्मसु नरानारोहयन् श्रेयसे
सच्छास्त्राणि च पाठयत्प्रतिदिनं संसेव्यतां संस्कृतम् ॥ ५ ॥
जीवान् बोधयदुत्तमामतिहितामध्यात्मविद्यां प्रियां
योगानामपि विद्यया मतिमतां स्वान्तं समापूयता ।
मन्त्राणां शुभशिक्षया च विदुषां सम्मोदयन्मानसं
तन्त्राद्यैश्च विनोदयद् बुधवरान् संसेव्यतां संस्कृतम् ॥ ६ ॥
काश्यां पञ्चमविश्वसंस्कृतमहासम्मेलनेऽस्मिन् मुदा
श्रीमद्भिः स्वपदार्पणेन सुमहान् लोकोपकारः कृतः ।
सत्यं तद्भवतां प्रयासन इह श्रौताध्वना संस्कृतेः
राष्ट्रे सुस्थितिसंस्थितिर्यदि भवेत् सम्मेलनं सार्थकम् ॥ ७ ॥
सम्मेलने समायाताः सर्वे नन्दन्तु सज्जनाः ।
सर्वेषामेव मान्यानां कुर्मः स्वागतमादरात् ॥ ८ ॥

BOOK REVIEW

Sāmba Purāṇa (Hindi Translation) By Dr. Vinod Chandra Srivastava
Foreward by Dr. R. C. Hazra; Published by Indological
Publications, Allahabad; pp. 18+340; Price Rs. 45; \$. 4.

The *Sāmba Purāṇa*, an important *Upa-purāṇa*, is included in all the lists of *Upapurāṇas*. It is a sectarian *Purāṇa* and contains matter concerning Sun-worship. Dr. V. C. Srivastava, who has already shown his proficiency in the study of the Sun-cult, has ably translated this *Purāṇa* into Hindi with copious notes, explaining the text with the help of comparative literature. The *Sāmba Purāṇa* contains 84 chapters, though in some MSS on account of joining two *adhyāyas* into one and dividing one *adhyāya* into two the number of chapters differs. The translator has faithfully tried to give an authentic translation of the text. The footnotes containing explanations show the vast knowledge of the translator. In the introduction the author has given valuable information about the *Sāmba Purāṇa* and the Sun cult. The book is a commendable addition in the field of *Purāṇic* studies. It would have been better if the original text on which translation is based had been given along with translation. Unfortunately printing mistakes are found here and there which should be removed in the next edition.

—Ganga Sagar Rai

THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

OF

THE ALL-INDIA KASHIRAJ TRUST

1. His Highness Maharaja Dr. Vibhuti Narain Singh, M.A., D.Litt.;
Fort, Ramnagar, Varanasi.—(*Chairman*).

Trustee nominated by the Govt. of India :—

2. Dr. Raghunath Singh, M.A., Ph.D., D.Litt., LL.B.; Varanasi.

Trustees nominated by the Govt. of Uttar Pradesh :—

3. Pt. Kamalapati Tripathi, Member of Parliament, Govt.
of India, New Delhi.
4. Vacant.

Trustees nominated by His Highness the Maharaja of Banaras :—

5. Maharaj-Kumar Dr. Raghubir Singh, M. A., D. Litt.;
Raghubir Niwas, Sitamau (Malwa).
6. Pt. Giridhari Lal Mehta, Varanasi; Managing Director;
Jardine Handerson Ltd.; Scindia Steam Navigation Ltd.;
Trustee : Vallabhram-Saligram Trust, Calcutta.
7. Pt. Baladeva Upadhyaya, M. A., Sahityacharya, Vachaspati;
Former Director, Sampurnananda Sanskrit University;
Ravindrapuri Varanasi.

Donation made to All India Kashi Raj Trust, Fort Ramnagar, Varanasi, will qualify for exemption under Sec. 80G of the Income Tax Act, 1961 in the hands of donors, vide certificate No. 58/59 (253/80-81/Tech) dated 9.12.80.

**RESOLUTION PASSED IN THE Vth WORLD SANSKRIT
CONFERENCE HELD IN VARANASI
(Oct. 21-26, 1981)**

1. The Fifth World Sanskrit Conference congratulates the Kashiraj Trust on the publication of the Critical Edition of the *Varāha Purāṇa* (with English Translation) and expresses the hope that the critical editions of the remaining *Purāṇas* will also be brought out in quick succession.

2. The Conference further notes with pleasure the announcement made by the Kashi Naresh on behalf of the Kashiraj Trust regarding the institution of a prize of Rs. 10,000/- to be awarded every third year for the best work relating to the *Purāṇas* published in any language and in any country.

Vol. XXIV, No. 2]



July, 1982

PURĀṆA

(Half-yearly Bulletin of the Purāṇa-Department)

*(With the financial Assistance from the Ministry of Education,
Government of India)*

VYĀSA-PŪRṆIMĀ NUMBER

आत्मा पुराणं वेदानाम्



ALL-INDIA KASHIRAJ TRUST
FORT, RAMNAGAR, VARANASI

Annual Subs.—Inland Rs. 50/-

Foreign £ 5

सम्पादक-मण्डल

डा० रामकरण शर्मा

उपशिक्षापरामर्शदाता, शिक्षामन्त्रालय तथा निदेशक, केन्द्रीय संस्कृत
संस्थान, नयी दिल्ली

डा० रामचन्द्र नारायण दाण्डेकर

भण्डारकर प्राच्यशोधसंस्थान, पुणे

EDITORIAL BOARD

Dr. R. K. Sharma

Deputy Educational Advisor (Skt.) Govt. of India and Director,
Kendriya Sanskrit Sansthana, New Delhi.

Dr. R. N. Dandekar

Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Pune

EDITOR

Ram Shankar Bhattacharya

M.A., Ph.D., Vyakaranacharya

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

Ganga Sagar Rai, M. A., Ph. D.

Giorgio Bonazzoli, M. A. (Milan), M. Th (Rome)

Shrish Chandra Chatt, M. A., Dip. Ed. (Edin.).

लेखकमहोदयैः प्रकटीकृता विचारास्तेषामेव स्वायत्ताः;

न पुनस्ते सम्पादकान् न्यासं च निबध्नन्ति

Authors are responsible for their views, which do not
bind the Editors and the Trust.

Authors are requested to use standard system of transliteration
and phonetic spellings when writing Sanskrit words in Roman letters.
They are also requested to use Devanāgarī letters for Sanskrit
ślokas and prose passages.

पुराणम्—PURĀṆA

Vol. XXIV., No. 2]

व्यासपूर्णमाङ्कः

[July, 6, 1982

लेखसूची—Contents

	Pages
1. व्यासस्तोत्रम् [Eulogy of Vyāsa] With notes by <i>Dr. Ram Shankar Bhattacharya</i>	249-252
2. ब्रह्म-शिव-नारायणस्तोत्रम् [Eulogy of Brahmā-Śiva and Nārāyaṇa] With notes By <i>Dr. Ram Shankar Bhattacharya</i>	253-260
3. Divine Presence in the Mūrti According to the Purāṇas [पौराणिकदृष्ट्या मूर्ती (= प्रतिमायां) देवताया विद्यमानता] By <i>Dr. Pinuccia Caracchi</i> ; Istituto di Indologia Via S. Ottavio, 20 10124 Torino (Italy)	261-285
4. The Role of Four Varṇas During the Time of Nīlādrimahodayam [नीलाद्रिमहोदयग्रन्थरचनासमये चतुर्णां वर्णानां प्रभावकर्माणि] By <i>Dr. Vidyat Lata Ray</i> Deptt. of Sanskrit Nayagarh College Nayagarh, Puri (Orissa)	286-296
5. The Syamantaka Gem Story—A Structural Analysis [स्यमन्तकमण्युपाख्यान-रचनाविन्यासस्य विश्लेषणम्] By <i>Dr. Ivan Strenski</i> ; Associate Prof. and Chair. Deptt. of Religious Studies Connecticut College New London, Connecticut 06320 (USA)	297-337
6. The Vāyu Purāṇa and the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa—A comparative story [वायु-मार्कण्डेय-पुराणयोस्तुलनात्मकमध्ययनम्]	338-352

By *Dr. Lallanji Gopal*;

Professor of Ancient Indian History
Culture and Archaeology, Banaras Hindu
University Varanasi 221 005

7. The Colophons in the Critically Edited
Purāṇas

[समीक्षात्मक-संस्करणवतां पुराणानां पुष्पिकाः]

353-383

By *Dr. Giorgio Bonazzoli*;

All-India Kashiraj Trust

8. Buddha As Depicted in the Purāṇas

[पुराणवर्णितो बुद्धः]

384-404

By *Dr. Ram Shankar Bhattacharya*

405-412

9. Book Reviews

1. *Brahmā in the Purāṇas* by *Mohd. Ismail Khan*; Reviewed by *Dr. Ram Shankar Bhattacharya*
2. *Some Graphical Purāṇic Texts on Brahmā* by *Mohd. Ismail Khan*; Reviewed by *Dr. Ram Shankar Bhattacharya*
3. *The Rise of the Religions Significance of Rāna* by *Frank Whaling*; Reviewed by *G. Bonazzoli*;
4. *Banāras—City of Light* by *Diana L. Eck*; Reviewed by *G. Bonazzoli*
5. अग्निपुराण की दार्शनिक एवं आयुर्वेदिक सामग्री का अध्ययन—सरिता हाण्डा ; Reviewed by *G. Bonazzoli*

10. Activities of the All-India Kashiraj Trust

413-416

11. Announcement and Our Requests

417

संस्कृतखण्डः

पुराणवर्णिताः पाशुपता योगाचार्याः

1-21

[*Yogacāryas of the Pasupata Sect as Depicted in the Purāṇas*]

प्रो० राजबल्लभ द्विवेदी

सम्पूर्णानन्दसंस्कृतविश्वविद्यालयीयः

1. आङ्गलभाषाप्रधानां निबन्धानां संक्षेपः

[Abstracts of Articles in English]

22-29

3. सर्वभारतीयकाशिराजमठस्य कार्यविवरणम्

30-33

4. ऋतुर्षमिनिनवप्रकरणानां विषये घोषणा ;

33-34

अस्माकं सविनयमन्यर्थम्

व्यासस्तोत्रम्

वेदव्यासमहं वन्दे वेदव्यासकरं हरिम् ।
पराशरसुतं सत्यवतीपुत्रं महामुनिम् ॥ ३८ ॥
प्राचीनगर्भं प्रवदन्ति यं वै

ज्ञानावतारं प्रथमं मुरारेः ।

आचार्यसिंहासनमाश्रितो यो
वेदान्तसूत्राण्यवदच्च मन्त्रान् ॥ ३९ ॥

अपान्तरतमा मुनिर्निगमदेशिकश्चादिमो
वदन्ति परमर्षयोऽपरविधिं च षष्ठं विधेः ।
चतुर्मुखमुखोदितं निगदितं च यत् पञ्चमं
जगद्धितकृते × × निजहितस्य वेदं नुमः ॥ ४० ॥
व्यासाम्भोधि (घौ) ज्ञानविज्ञानलीनं
तस्मिन् जातं भारताम्भोजपुष्पम् ।
हंसा हंसा मोदिता यस्य मोदात्
त्यक्त्वासारां संस्मृतिं यान्ति पारम् ॥ ४१ ॥

मानं यस्य वचः सुरासुरगणैः सद्भिर्नरैर्मन्यते
ज्ञानं येन च भण्यते श्रमहरं शान्तिप्रदं चामृतम् ।
यद् वाच्यार्थचतुष्टयं तदृषयः प्राहूर्तृणां तुष्टये
यस्मिन् नास्ति न चास्य तत् कचिदपि व्यासं तमेनं भजे ॥ ४२ ॥

भारतस्य मिषतो निगमार्थो
भारते प्रकटितः परमार्थः ।
येन संसृतिविहीनजनानां
संस्कृतिर्भवति चामृतहेतुः ॥ ४३ ॥

भक्तिविरक्त्यनुभूति - प्रधानं
केशवकीर्त्यमृतैकनिधानम् ।
येन मुदे निखिलस्य पुराणं
व्यासमहं प्रणमामि पुराणम् ॥ ४४ ॥

कृष्णद्वैपायनं वन्दे व्यासं तमरूपीपतिम् ।

शुको यन्मुखतो जातो यन्मुखात् परमागमम् ॥ ४५ ॥

इत्युग्रश्रवसा गीतं जनिना रोमहर्षजेः ।

पठेद् वा शृणुयाद् स्तोत्रं स प्रसावं गुरोर्भजेत् ॥ ४६ ॥

(वाङ्मन्यवसंहिता, यत्किञ्च ४।३१।३८-४६)

NOTES

As the printed text of the *stotra* contains corrupt readings almost in all the stanzas, they are not fully intelligible and as such we refrain from giving a full translation of the *stotra*. Some of the important expressions of this *stotra* are explained here in brief. The metres used in this *stotra* are Pṛthvī (stanza 40), Śalinī (41), Svāgatā (43), Dodhaka (44) and Śārdūlavikrīḍita (42) besides the well-known Anuṣṭubh and Upajāti.

(38) The traditional view that Vyāsa is the son of Parāśara and Satyawatī is stated here. The word '*veda-vyāsakara*' means 'one who arranges or divides the Vedas'. It is clearly stated in the Mbh. and the Purāṇas that the sage Kṛṣṇa-dvaipāyana was called Vyāsa or Vedavyāsa on account of his having arranged or divided the Vedas.

(39) Vyāsa is regarded as the *jñānāvatāra* of Viṣṇu. This seems to be an established view, for Vācaspati in his Bhāmatī describes Vyāsa as *jñānā-śaktyavatāra* of Hari (benedictory verse 5).¹ Vyāsa is said to be the author of the Vedāntasūtra (the well-known Brahmasūtra) and the *mantras*. The precise meaning of the word *mantra* is not quite clear.

-
1. ब्रह्मसूत्रकृते तस्मै वेदव्यासाय धीमते । ज्ञानशक्त्यवताराय नमो भगवतो हरेः ॥ There is an interesting grammatical discussion on the formation of the word ज्ञानशक्त्यवतार in the Kalpataru and Parimala sub-commentaries. The Gauḍīya school does not, however, regard Vyāsa as a ज्ञानप्रकाशक अवतार. According to this school Dattātreya, Matsya, Catuḥsana (Sanaka, Sanandana, Sanātana and Sanatkumāra) and Kapila fall under this class. It regards Vyāsa, Nārada and Buddha as incarnations establishing virtuousness (धर्मप्रकाशक अवतार). In the four-fold division of avatāras Vyāsa falls under the Prābhava division, the other three being Āveśa, Vaibhava and Parāvastha. Usually Vyāsa is regarded as one of the twenty-five līlāvatāras; vide Saṅkṣepa-bhāgavatāmṛta, section on Avatāra,

As regards the statement that Vyāsa was called by the name Prācīnagarbha, *vide* Śānti-p. 349.66. (अपान्तरतमाश्चैव वेदाचार्यः स उच्यते । प्राचीनगर्भं तमृषिं प्रवदन्तीह केचन); see below for the Apāntaratamas.²

(40) To keep the metre intact we have read निगमदेशिक. in the place of the printed reading निगमादेशिकः. The sense of अपरविधि च षष्ठं विधेः is not quite clear; the meaning of the third foot is also not fully intelligible. In the fourth foot after जगद्वितकृते two syllables (one *laghu* and the other *guru*) are wanting.

About Apāntaratamas, the Mbh. informs us that he came out from the syllable मोस् pronounced by Bhagavat, that he arranged the Vedas in the Svāyambhuva manvantara, that he received from Bhagavat the boon that he would promulgate dharma in all the manvantaras and that he would be born as the son of Parāśara in the family of Vasiṣṭha (Śānti-p. 349.38-59). The traditional view that the ancient sage Apāntaratamas was born as Kṛṣṇadvaipāyana was known to Śaṅkarācārya.³

(41) In verses 41-43 the Mahābhārata is extolled. Here the Mbh. is compared to a lotus floating on the ocean in the form of Vyāsa. The third foot is not quite intelligible. In the fourth foot संस्मृति must be corrected to संसृति (असारं संसृतिं त्यक्त्वा हंसाः पारं यान्ति), so that this foot becomes meaningful.

2. The view propounded in Śānti-p. 349. 64-68 about the propagation of the five śāstras, (namely Trayi, Sāmkhya, etc.) in which Apāntaratamas has been associated with the Vedas is found in Ahirbudhnyasamhitā, Ch. II also. According to F. O. Schrader, the sage who is said to have fashioned the three Vedas was called Apāntaratapas (Introduction to the Pancarātra and the Ahirbudhnyasamhitā, pp. 109-110).

3. अपान्तरतमा नाम वेदाचार्यः पुराणेषु विष्णुनियोगात् कलिदापरयोः सन्धौ कृष्णद्वैपायनः संबभूव-इति स्मरन्ति (Śārīraka-bhāṣya 3.3.32). The following verses from the Brhadyogi-yajñavalkya about the connection of Apāntaratamas with the Vedas are worthy of notice : “एव एक हि विज्ञेयः प्रभवो योऽस्य सप्तमः । गृहोतः सप्तसिद्धान्तै रन्यत्र ब्रह्मवाणिभिः ॥ हिरण्यवर्णैः कपिलै रपान्तरतमै- स्तथा । सप्तकुमारै रब्रह्मिण्यै स्तथा पाशुपतै रपि ॥ पाञ्चरात्रैः सप्तोद्युक्तैः सिद्धान्तै रपि सप्तभिः । मेदैस्त्रिषष्टिभि रसप्तवेदै रन्यथा पुनः ॥” (2. 66-68).

(42) It is difficult to ascertain what are the four denoted senses (*vācyaṛtha-catuşṭaya*). The fourth foot means the same as *यदिहास्ति तदन्यत्र यन्नेहास्ति न तत् क्वचित्* (Svargārohaṇa-p. 5.50); *vide* Ādiparvan Ch. I, for the glorification of the Mahābhārata.

(43) *Samṣṛti-vihīna* must be corrected to *saṁskṛtivyihīna*. *Samṣṛti* i. e. *saṁskāra* is said to be the means of acquiring *amṛta* (immortality).

(44) It is said that the Purāṇa, which chiefly deals with *bhakti* etc. as well as with the glorious deeds of Kṛṣṇa, was composed by Vyāsa. The verb in the sentence (2nd half), which is in passive voice, is wanting, thus making the sentence elliptical. The word *purāṇa* in the 4th line qualifies Vyāsa.

(45) Vyāsa is said to be the husband of Araṇī and the father of Śuka, who achieved divine knowledge from his father. Śuka, being the son of Araṇī, was called Āraṇeya or Araṇīsuta in the Mbh. and the Purāṇas. The Śānti-p. (324. 1-11) however gives a mythical account of the birth of Śuka (taking Araṇi or Araṇī as a piece of sacrificial wood i. e. the piece of wood used for kindling the sacred fire by attrition); cp. Harivaṁśa I. 18.50-51 (पराशर-कुलोत्पन्नः शुको नाम महातपाः । व्यासादरण्यां संभूतो विघ्नमोऽग्निरिव ज्वलन्) and Vāyu-p. 73.28-29.

(46) Ugraśravas is said to be the *jani* of Romaharṣaṇa. Since the Purāṇic tradition regards Ugraśravas as the son of Romaharṣaṇa (or Lomaharṣaṇa) we must take Romaharṣaṇi as another name of Romaharṣaṇa. Names of a similar nature are sometimes found in the Purāṇic works, as e. g. Agastya-Agasti (names of the same sage), Pulastya-Pulasti, Uttama-Auttami, Puṣkarasādi-Pauṣkarasādi, Bāṣkala-Bāṣkali, Aruṇa-Āruṇi, Dadhīca-Dadhīci, Cyavana-Cyāvani. *Jani*, which usually means birth, must be taken here in the sense of 'one who is born' i. e. a son (*vide* the comm. on the Uṇādisūtra जनिवसिर्वामिण् 4 130).

As this *stotra* is said to have been sung (*gītam*) by Ugraśravas, it is quite likely that it occurs in some Purāṇic work hitherto unpublished.

—Ram Shankar Bhattacharya

ब्रह्म-शिव-नारायण-स्तोत्रम्

[A eulogy addressed to Brahmā, Śiva & Nārāyaṇa separately in three Purāṇic works.]

१ नमो हिरण्यगर्भाय ब्रह्मविष्णुशिवात्मने ।
 अविज्ञातस्वरूपाय कैवल्यायामृताय च ॥
 (काशी० २।३०; धर्मारण्य० ३।१४; औश० ७५०)
 २ यं न देवा विजानन्ति मनो यत्रापि ३ कुण्ठितम् ।
 ४ न यत्र वाक् प्रसरति नमस्तस्मै चिदात्मने ॥ (३१; १५)
 योगिनो यं हृदाकाशे ५ प्रणिधानेन निश्चलाः ।
 ज्योतीरूपं प्रपश्यन्ति तस्मै श्रीब्रह्मणे नमः ॥ (३२; १६)
 कालात् पराय कालाय स्वेच्छया पुरुषाय च ।
 गुणत्रयस्वरूपाय नमः प्रकृतिरूपिणे ॥ (३३; १७)
 विष्णवे सत्वरूपाय रजोरूपाय वेधसे ।
 ६ तमसे रुद्ररूपाय स्थितिसर्गान्तकारिणे ॥ (३४; १८)
 नमो बुद्धिस्वरूपाय ७ त्रिधाहंकृतये नमः ।
 पञ्चतन्मात्ररूपाय ८ पञ्च - कर्मेन्द्रियात्मने ॥ (३५; १९)
 ९ नमो मनः-स्वरूपाय पञ्चबुद्धीन्द्रियात्मने ।
 क्षित्यादिपञ्चरूपाय नमस्ते विषयात्मने ॥ (३६; २०)
 नमो ब्रह्माण्डरूपाय तदन्तर्वर्तिने नमः ।
 अर्वाचीनपराचीनविश्वरूपाय ते नमः ॥ (३७; २१)

-
१. नमो हिरण्यरूपाय (वैकट० संस्क०); नमोऽस्त्वनन्तरूपाय नीलकण्ठ
 नमोऽस्तु ते (धर्मा०); नमो नारायणायेश महद्ब्रह्मस्वरूपिणे (औश०) ।
 २. नान्तं देवा विजानन्ति यस्य तस्मै नमो नमः (धर्मा०)
 ३. मनो यत्रापि कुण्ठति (औश०) ।
 ४. यं न वाचः प्रशंसन्ति (धर्मा०); न निःसरति वाक् यत्र (औश०) ।
 ५. हृदःकोशे (धर्मा०) ।
 ६. तमोरूपाय रुद्राय (धर्मा०); नमस्ते रुद्ररूपाय (औश०) ।
 ७. त्रिधाहंकारमूर्तये (धर्मा०) ।
 ८. नमः प्रकृतिरूपिणे (धर्मा०) ।
 ९. नमो नमःस्वरूपाय (काशी०; धर्मा०; औश०) ।

अनित्यनित्यरूपाय सदसत्पतये नमः ।
 १० समस्तभक्तकृपया स्वेच्छाविष्कृतविग्रह ॥ (३८; २२)
 तव ११ निःश्वसितं वेदास्तव स्वेदोऽखिलं जगत् ।
 १२ विश्वा भूतानि ते पादः शीर्ष्णो द्यौः समवर्तत ॥ (३९; २३)
 १३ नाभ्या आसीदन्तरिक्षं लोमानि च वनस्पतिः ।
 चन्द्रमा मनसो जातश्चक्षुः सूर्यस्तव प्रभो ॥ (४०; २४)
 त्वमेव सर्वं त्वयि देव सर्वं
 १४ स्तोता स्तुतिः स्तव्य इह त्वमेव ।
 ईश त्वया वास्यमिदं हि सर्वं
 नमोऽस्तु भूयोऽपि नमो नमस्ते ॥ (४१; २५)
 (स्कन्द० वङ्गवासि-वेङ्कटेश्वर संस्करण)

१०. साधकानां हितार्थाय स्वेच्छाविष्कृतविग्रह (औश०); नमस्ते भक्तकृपया स्वेच्छा (धर्मा० वेंकटसंस्क०) ।
 ११. श्लोकोऽयं नास्ति । स्वेच्छाविष्कृतविग्रह इत्यनन्तरम् 'अग्रतस्तु नमस्तुभ्यं पृष्ठ-
 तस्तु नमो नमः । सर्वतो व्यासरूपाय भूयो भूयो नमो नमः ॥' इति पठ्यते ।
 (औश०) ।
 १२. विश्वभूतानि ते पादः शिरो (धर्मा०) ।
 १३. श्लोकोऽयं नास्ति (औश०) ।
 १४. सर्वस्तुतिस्तव्यः (धर्मा०) ।

NOTES

Though the eulogy printed above does not have any poetical charm so far as the diction and metre are concerned, yet *it has a great importance*, for it is found to have been used to eulogize three different deities in three different Purāṇic works, viz. the Kāśī-khaṇḍa, the Dharmāranyakhaṇḍa and the Auśanasa Upapurāṇa (with slight variations). In the Kāśīkhaṇḍa (2.30-41) it is spoken out to Brahmā, in the Dharmāranya-khaṇḍa (3.14-25) to Śiva and in the Auśanasa-upapurāṇa to Nārāyaṇa—a fact which shows that originally this *stotra* must have been composed to eulogize any one of the three deities and afterwards it was applied to the other deities on account of its expounding philosophical views in a lucid manner. It is however impossible to ascertain the deity addressing to which this *stotra* was at first composed by the Purāṇic author.

It is to be noted in this connection that there are some *stotras* (in different Purāṇic works) in which a considerable number of stanzas are found more or less identical. A study of such *stotras* may yield important results so far as the chronology of the relevant Purāṇic sections is concerned.

In the Kāśīkhaṇḍa (ch. 2) this *stotra* (called Abhiṣṭada in 2.47) was addressed by the Devas to Brahmā, so that he, being pleased, could find some way to lower the highly enlarged peak of the Vindhya hill. It is said that the hill, being envious of mount Meru, increased its height in order to obstruct the path of the sun. As a result of this obstruction, the whole world fell into disaster. Getting afraid the gods requested Brahmā to find out some means so that the height of the Vindhya hill could be lowered. This story with minor variations is found in several Purāṇic works and also in the Mbh. Vana-p. 104. The Rāmāyaṇa also refers to it in 3.11.85.

In the Dharmāranyakhaṇḍa (ch. 3) it is said that at the beginning of the Tretā-yuga, Dharmarāja began to practise severe penance. Being afraid of Dharmarāja the devas with Brahmā went to mt. Kailāsa to see Śiva. On seeing Śiva, Brahmā extolled him by uttering this eulogy (verses 14-25).

In the Auśanasa-upapurāṇa the *stotra* occurs in the section on Vindhya-māhātmya (ch. 1). It is said that once Nārada came to the Badarikā āśrama and extolled Nārāyaṇa by uttering this *stotra*. [The verses of this Upapurāṇa have been taken from the Vaidyakavṛttānta (a highly learned work in Bengali dealing with the history of the Āyurvedic teachers) by Pt. Gurupada Haldar in which the first chapter of this Upapurāṇa has been quoted. Unfortunately the serial number of these verses has not been given by the author]¹

As the Kāśīkhaṇḍa is well known we take the Kāśīkhaṇḍa version as original and place the different readings of the Dharmāranyakhaṇḍa (a sub-division of the Brahmakhaṇḍa of the Skandapurāṇa) and the Auśanasa-upapurāṇa in the footnotes.

1. According to Dr. Hazra the Auśanasa-upapurāṇa is one of the lost Upapurāṇas (St Up. II, p. 501-502). There is another lost Upapurāṇa called Bṛhad-Auśanasa-upapurāṇa (*ibid*, p. 504-505). Dr. Hazra informs us that 'there are MSS. of a Vindhya-māhātmya which claim to be a part of this Upapurāṇa.

In this *stotra* it is not the personality of the deity but the omnipresence and immanence of the deity which is predominant. That is why it hardly contains any description which is peculiar to any one of the three deities. The *stotra* speaks of all the important categories (*prameyas*) of *adhyātma-vidyā* and identifies them with the deity. The repeated use of the word *namas* (which shows obeisance) has undoubtedly rendered the *stotra* sublime and effective. Some of the important words in this *stotra* are explained here in brief.

In the Ṛg-veda (10.121) Hiranyagarbha is the only lord of the existent and is the one god above the gods. He is not only the creator but also the preserver and destroyer of the phenomenal world. He is often called Prajāpati in the Vedic works. In the Purāṇas the name Hiranyagarbha is almost exclusively applied to the god associated with the act of creation (usually called Brahmā) (Mark. p. 46.20-21a) and not to the god associated with the act of preservation or destruction. It seems that on account of the prominence of the act of creation (cp. सर्वविकाराणां जनिमूलत्वात्, Śaṅkara on Muṇḍaka 2.1.2) the name Hiranyagarbha came to be applied to the creator Brahmā to whom the word Prajāpati is frequently applied by the authors of the Purāṇas. The Purāṇas regarded Brahmā as the first teacher of the Vedas (in each creation) and from the Upaniṣads we learn that the line of teachers does not extend beyond Hiranyagarbha (*vide* Br.-up. 2.6.3 with the bhāṣya).

नमो हिरण्यगर्भाय....अमृताय च—The name Hiranyagarbha has been explained as 'one whose essence (*garbha*) consists in divine knowledge (*hiranya*)'; or 'one in whom *hiranya* (brahmāṇḍa, cosmic egg) exists'.¹ Hiranyagarbha is regarded here as identical

1. हितं रमणीयम् अत्युज्ज्वलं ज्ञानं गर्भः अन्तःसारो यस्य (Śaṅkara on Śvetāśvatara-up. 3.4). हिरण्यं गर्भे अस्य, हिरण्यस्य गर्भो वा ब्रह्माण्डप्रभवत्वात् (Kṣīrasvāmin on Amara 1.1.76). हिरण्यं ब्रह्माण्डरूपं यस्येश्वरस्य प्रजापतेर्गर्भे वर्तते सोऽयं हिरण्यगर्भः; यद्वा हिरण्यस्य ब्रह्माण्डस्य मध्ये सत्यलोके गर्भरूपेण-वस्थितः चतुर्मुखो हिरण्यगर्भः (Sāyaṇa on Tai. Sam.); हिरण्यमयस्य अण्डस्य गर्भभूतः प्रजापतिरिहिरण्यगर्भः । यद्वा हिरण्यमयोऽण्डो गर्भवद् यस्योदरे वर्तते सोऽसौ सृष्टारमा हिरण्यगर्भ इत्युच्यते (Sāyaṇa on RV. 10.121.1). The Ven. ed. reads हिरण्यरूपाय, Prajāpati Hiranyagarbha may rightly be described as *hiranyarūpa*; see the etymology of *hiranya* in connection with Prajāpati in Śatapatha-br. 7.4.1.16,

with *kaivalya* (emancipation, *mokṣa*) and *amṛta* (immortality). Since Hiranyagarbha is not the immutable ultimate principle, nor is he really bereft of activity (he is called *saguṇa brahman* or *kārya brahman* by the philosophers), the above description cannot be taken as philosophically valid; it must be taken as figurative. Since Hiranyagarbha possesses an extremely purified limiting adjunct the epithets applicable to the absolute brahman are also applied to him (*vide* Śaṅkara on Br.-up. 1.4.6). Such figurative descriptions are often found in eulogies.

यं न देवा....चिदात्मने—*Deva* may be taken either in the sense of 'the wise' or in the sense of 'the organs' (*vide* bhāṣya on Īśa-up. 4). For the idea expressed in मनो....प्रसरति *vide* Tai.-up. 2. 4. 1 (यतो वाचो निवर्तन्ते अप्राप्य मनसा सह) and Kāṭha-up. 6. 12. *Cidātman*—one whose essential nature consists in *cit* (divine consciousness). If *cit* is taken in the sense of 'absolute awareness', then the description must be taken as figurative.

योगिनो यं....नमः—The heart, according to yogins, is the most suitable place for practising meditation. *Praṇidhāna* is either 'the acute form of one-pointedness' or 'a particular kind of devotion'. Since *hṛdaya* (one of the *dhāraṇādeśas*) is not elemental (*bhautika*) but spiritual (*ādhyātmika*) the *jyotis* perceived in the heart is not of the nature of external light; the word *jyotis* is used in the sense of 'illuminating entity' (*avabhāsaka*); *vide* Śāṅkabhāṣya 1.1.24. In *Śrī-brahman*, *Śrī* may rightly be taken in the sense of *aparā vidyā* (cp. ऋचो यजूंषि सामानि सा हि श्रीरमुता सताम्—Tai. Br. 1. 2. 26. 2). As the tradition of sages holds that the line of teachers does not extend beyond Hiranyagarbha, it is reasonable to regard Hiranyagarbha as the repository of Vedic lore (*Śrī*). *Śrī* may however mean the supersensuous powers also, which, according to the Purāṇas, are innate in the creator Prajāpati.

कालात्....पुरुषाय च —Strictly speaking it is the absolute brahman (and not the creator Brahmā or any other deity) that transcends time. To Brahmā the act of transcending time is applied figuratively. स्वेच्छया पुरुषाय च—'He has willingly assumed the forms of sentient beings (*puruṣa* i. e. *jīva*)'—it may refer to the doctrine that the embodied beings are the conditioned forms of the absolute brahman (*vide* Br.-up. 1.4.7; Chāndogya-up. 6.3.2). The commentator

Rāmānanda however takes it to express the same sense as Viṣṇu-p. 1.2.29 (प्रधानपुरुषं चापि प्रविश्यात्मेच्छया हरिः । क्षोभयामास संप्राप्ते सर्गकाले). गुणत्रयस्वरूपाय नमः प्रकृतिरूपिणे—*Guṇas*, namely *sattva* (the sentient principle), *rajas* (the mutative principle) and *tamas* (the static principle) are identified with *Brahmā*. A distinction is made here between the *guṇas* and the *prakṛti* which is usually regarded as a name for the three *guṇas*. It appears that here '*guṇa*' means 'the *guṇas* in the quiescent state' and *prakṛti* means 'the *guṇas* in the state of evolution'. The followers of the Śaivādvaita system regard *prakṛti* and *guṇa* as two distinct *tattvas* and state that the *guṇas* arise from the agitated *prakṛti* (Tantrasāra, VIII).

विष्णवे...कारिणे—Here *Brahmā* is considered to be identical with Viṣṇu and Rudra (Śiva). That *Brahmā*, Viṣṇu and Rudra are respectively connected with the *rajas*, *sattva* and *tamas guṇas* as well as with the act of creation, preservation and destruction respectively is an established doctrine of the Purāṇas (Matsya-p. 3. 14-16; Mārkaṇḍeya-p. 46. 14-18).

नमो बुद्धि....कर्मन्दित्रयात्मने—In the following stanzas *Brahmā* is regarded as identical with *buddhi* etc. This identity is based on his superintendency (*adhiṣṭhātṛtva*). *Buddhi* is the cognitive principle, known also as the *mahattattva*. *Ahaṁkṛti* i. e. *ahaṁkāra* (*ahaṁkṛti* seems to have been used to keep the metre intact) has, according to the Sāṁkhya philosophy and the Purāṇas, three aspects, namely *vaikṛtika* or *vaikṛta*, *taijasa* and *bhūtadi*, which are respectively predominated by the *sattva*, *rajas* and *tamas guṇas*. The chapters on *sarga* in the Purāṇas contain valuable information regarding the nature and genesis of the five *tanmātras*, namely *śabdatanmātra* etc. The five *karmendriyas* (motor organs or the powers of voluntary movement) are well known. The physical organs are to be known as the seats (*adhiṣṭhāna*) of the organs.

नमो मनःस्वरूपाय...विषयात्मने—Though all the three Purāṇic texts read नमो नमःस्वरूपाय yet there is not the slightest doubt that it is a corrupt reading, for the *manas* principle remains unexpressed if it is not read here. Moreover, it is improper to regard the deity as 'the same as *namas*'. A very precise definition of *manas* has been given by Śaṅkarācārya as सर्वार्थविषयं त्रैकाल्यवृत्ति मन एकमनेकवृत्तिकम् (Bhāṣya on Br-up. 2.4.6). Five *buddhīndriyas* are often called *jñāne-*

ndriyas. For the reason for using the words *jñānendriya* and *karmendriya*, vide Śārīrakabhāṣya 2.4.6. The nature of these two kinds of organs are to be known according to the sāstric tradition. The five *bhūtas*, namely kṣiti (earth), ap (water), tejas (light), vāyu (air) and ākāśa (the substance whose attribute is sound only) are not to be confounded with earth etc. *Viśaya* is used here in the sense of 'bhautikas' i. e. 'the objects made up of the five *bhūtas*'—'the gross or complex objects'.

नमो ब्रह्माण्ड...ते नमः—Brahmāṇḍa is the cosmic egg, which, according to the Purāṇas, consists of the seven *lokas*. *Tadantarvartin*—that which exists in the brahmāṇḍa. 'You are both *arvācīna* and *parācīna viśvarūpas*' (the manifold world). *Arvācīna*—'belonging to the proximate time' or 'of recent origin'; *parācīna*—'belonging to ancient times' or 'falling beyond the field of experience'. The commentator takes *arvācīna* and *parācīna* in the sense of '*aparākālika*' and '*pūrvakālika*' respectively.

अनित्यनित्य...नमः—Both the absolute brahman and the qualified brahman are sometimes described in the Upaniṣads etc. as possessing opposite attributes.¹ Commentators show that there is no real contradiction in such descriptions. It is needless to say that the words *nitya* and *sat* as well as their opposites are taken in more than one sense. समस्तभक्त....विग्रह—'He assumes various *vigrahas* out of compassion to his devotees'; cp. उपासकानां कार्यार्थं ब्रह्मणो रूपकल्पना (Rāmātāpani-up. 1.1.7). *Vigrahas* are the *mūrtis* to be worshipped; it may mean the incarnations also. The Vaiṣṇava view about the assuming of *vigrahas* by the lord finds its excellent expression in the following couplet: "मणिर्यथा विभागेन नीलपीतादिभिर्भूतः । रूपभेदमवाप्नोति ध्यानभेदात् तथाच्युतः ॥"

तव निःश्वसितं....तव प्रभो—This view about the Vedas is based on the Br-up. passage 'अस्य महतो मूतस्य निःश्वसितमेतद् यद्गृध्रेदो' (2.4.10). The purpose of using the word 'breath' is to show that the Vedas came out of the infinite reality without the slightest

1. न सत् तन्नासदुच्यते (Gītā 13.12); सदसच्चाहमर्जुन (Gītā 9.19); सदसत्त्वत्परं यत् (Gītā 11.37); उभयमेतत् प्रजापति निरुक्तश्चानिरुक्तश्च परिमितश्चापरिमितश्च (Śatapatha-br. 6.5.3.7); द्वे वाव ब्रह्मणो रूपे मूर्ते चामूर्ते च- (Br-up. 2.3.1); सच्च त्यच्च अभवत् (Tai-Up. 2.6; त्यत् meaning अमूर्त).

effort. The view expressed in तव स्वेदोऽखिलं जगत् is conspicuous for its absence in the Vedic works. If *sveda* (sweat) is taken in the sense of 'seed i. e. energy placed in water' (अप्सु विसृष्टं बीर्यं शक्तिविशेषः) then the sentence may be taken as expressing the same idea as is found in Manu 1.9 (*vide* the comm.); cp. Chān. Up. 6.2-4 which says that water was created by Being and that this in turn, willed to become many and to grow forth. विश्वा भूतानि....प्रभो—These lines are evidently based on the *Puruṣasūkta* (RV. 10.90.3,13,14). It is noteworthy that the sentence लोमानि च वनस्पतिः is not found in the RV. The view is, however, found in the *Viṣṇupurāṇa* : “ओषधयः फलमूलानि रोमम्यस्तस्य जज्ञिरे” (1.5.50); cp. Tai-Br. 3.10.8.7 (ओषधिवनस्पतयो मे लोमसु श्रिताः). *Vanaspati* may be taken here in a general sense, and not in the restricted sense of 'those which bear fruits but not flowers'.

त्वमेव....नमो नमस्ते—The third foot reminds one of the first foot of the first *mantra* of the *Īśāvāsyā-upaniṣad* (ईशा वास्यमिदं सर्वम्). An echo of the fourth foot is found in *Gītā*.11.39 (पुनश्च भूयोऽपि नमो नमस्ते; cp. भूयिष्ठां ते नम उक्तिं विधेम (*Īśāvāsyā-up.* 18).

The variant readings in the *Dharmāranyakhaṇḍa* do not show any important difference in meaning. Since Śiva is eulogized, the words *Nilakanṭha* (in vocative case) and *anantarāpāya* (14) have been used. As to why Śiva came to be called by the name *Nilakanṭha*, see *Mbh.* Ādi-p.18.41-43. The word *anantarāpa* is significant as in the Vedas, the Rudras are regarded as many (असंख्याताः सहस्राणि ये रुद्रा अघि भूम्याम् YV.16.54). The reading नमः प्रकृतिरूपिणे (19) is corrupt, as it is already read in verse 17. The reading तव वेदोऽखिलं जगत् (23) (your Veda is the whole world) is better than the reading in the *Kāśikhaṇḍa*, for there are authoritative statements to support this view (cp. छन्दोग एव प्रथममेतद् विश्वं व्यवर्तत, *Vākyapadīya* 1.120).

The only variant reading in the *Auśanasa-upapurāṇa* that deserves consideration is साधकानां हितार्थाय in the place of समस्तभक्तकृपया (*Kāśikhaṇḍa* 38) or नमस्ते भक्तकृपया (*Dharmāranyo* 22, Ven. ed.). As the expression भक्तकृपया is grammatically objectionable, the reading in the *Upapurāṇa* seems preferable.

Ram shankar Bhattacharya

THE DIVINE PRESENCE IN THE MŪRTI ACCORDING TO THE PURĀṆA-S

By

PINUCCIA CARACCHI

The cult of the *mūrti*, which has such a great importance in Hindu religious practices has been equated with idolatry in Western countries for a long time. For example, E. O. Martin at the beginning of the century wrote : "The most striking characteristic of Hinduism is idolatry. Idols, idols in every where, they are found all over the lands in millions."¹ The statements of Rev. Sherring in a book published in 1864 are even worse : "Idolatry has, for many centuries, drunk the life-blood of the Hindu with insatiate thirst, has covered with its pollutions the fair and fertile soil of India, has drenched the land with its poisoned waters, and has rendered its inhabitants as godless as it was possible for them to become."² Fortunately nowadays this wrong view has largely disappeared, especially thanks to the enlightening studies of Coomaraswamy, Avalon, Danielou³ and others. From the indologist to those who have touched the subject only superficially, no one would now affirm that the cult of sacred images in India is idolatrous. In fact, the *mūrti* is not worshipped as a material object,

* I heartily thank Paṇḍita Paśupati Nāth Bhaṭṭācārya Śāstrī, Paṇḍita Hīrāmaṇi Mīśra of the All-India Kashiraj Trust, Pt. Braja Kīśora Tripāṭhī Śāstrī and all the other paṇḍita-s who helped me to understand the living values of Tradition.

1. Cf. *The Gods of India*, Delhi, 1972 (rep.), p. 8.
2. Cf. M. A. SHERRING, *Benares, the Sacred City of the Hindus*, Delhi, 1975 (rep. of 1868), p. 46.
3. Among the many works and articles of Coomaraswamy dealing with this subject the most relevant two are *The Transformation of Nature in Art*, New York, 1934 (Indian Edition, Delhi, 1974) and *The Dance of Śiva*, Delhi, 1968. Of A. DANIELOU, *The Hindu Polytheism*, London, 1963 is worthy of special mention. See also of A. AVALON, *Śakti and Sakta*, Madras, 1975 (VII ed.), especially chap. VIII.

rather the Divinity is worshipped through the *mūrti*. Strictly speaking, one should not say cult "of" the *mūrti* but cult "in" the *mūrti*, that is the cult of that Divinity which is invoked in the image through the rite of *āvāhana* and is removed from it through *visarjana*.⁴

Therefore, *āvāhana* and *visarjana* are thought to effect a mystic change in the *mūrti*. This change, however, has been interpreted by some scholars just as a device to help devotion during worship. A. K. Coomaraswamy, for example, when speaking of *āvāhana* and *visarjana* rites, says : 'It should not be supposed that the deity, by invocation and dismissal, is made to come or go, for omnipresence does not move; these ceremonies are really projections of the worshipper's own mental attitude toward the image. By invocation he announces to himself his intention of using the image as a means of communion with the Angel; by dismissal he announces that his service has been completed, and that he no longer regards the image as a link between himself and the deity.'⁵ Avalon speaks in very similar terms. According to him the meaning of the *āvāhana*, the *pūjā* and the *visarjana* is that the mind of the faithful recognizes, worships and then leaves the presence of the Divinity in the *mūrti*, which is a consequence of the divine omnipresence. So these rituals would not produce any objective change in the *mūrti*, but only a change in the mental attitude of the faithful towards the *mūrti*.⁶ The problem now is to see whether this interpretation can be supported by the Scriptures and whether it can lead to a satisfactory and definite solution of the problem of the relation between the Divinity and the *mūrti*. Looking through the *Purāṇa*-s, *Āgama*-s and *Tantra*-s, we can find many starting points for reflecting on this matter. In the puranic texts, especially, there is often a section devoted to the construction, consecration and worship of sacred images. These sections chiefly give practical rules and technical details, but here and there it is possible to find some theoretical passages and some reflections on the meaning of the Divinity's images. In the puranic texts, on which this rese-

4. Cf. S. I. VARMA, *Bhārat mā pratik-pūjā kā ārambh aur vikās*, Patna, 1974, p. 14 : हम वस्तुतः पत्थर नहीं पूजते, लेकिन पत्थर में मन्त्र द्वारा ईश्वर की सत्ता लाकर ईश्वर को पूजते हैं ।

5. *The Transformation*, p. 169

6. See A. AVALON, *op. cit.*, pp. 303-304

arch is mainly based, there are certainly some passages supporting the interpretations of Coomaraswamy and Avalon.

Viṣṇudharmottara-purāṇa, 3. 108, for example, is completely devoted to the solution of this problem : how can the Omnipresent Absolute, who pervades being and non-being, be touched by the *āvāhana*?⁷ The answer is given very clearly : *āvāhana* and *pūjā* do not touch the Supreme who is present always and everywhere in the universe. Therefore, *pūjā* is only "a means for the satisfaction of the mind" (केवलं कारणं तत्र मनसस्तुष्टिकारणम्). For this reason alone the Supreme is called even though He is already present. Worship cannot have any effect on Him who is by his very nature always blissful, but He accepts it to fulfil the *bhakti* of his devotees. For this reason, indeed, He Himself gives the impulse for the worship of sacred images, but the worshipper should always be aware of the divine omnipresence, by virtue of which not only the *mūrti* but also the place and the objects used in *pūjā* as well as all the other things are pervaded by the Divinity.⁸ The following statement of the *Parama-samhitā* is even clearer : "God is neither established nor protected by anyone. He only receives the *pūjā* of the *bhakta*-s."⁹

From this assertion is it necessary to infer that the *āvāhana* and the other rites do not touch the sacred image at all, but only touch the worshipper's mind? First, we may note that in the quoted passages, and generally wherever the problem of the *mūrti* is considered from this point of view, the intention is to stress the idea that the Omnipresent Absolute can never be contained in the narrow limits of a man-made form, and that His Blissfulness cannot be increased by any act of worship¹⁰. Here the

7. Cf. *Viṣṇudharmottara-Purāṇa*, *Third Khaṇḍa*, edit. by P. Shah, Baroda, 1958, 3. 108. 3cd-5.

8. *Ibidem*, 3. 108. 14-22. This idea, in a strictly non-dualistic perspective, is beautifully expressed also in a *śloka* of *Mahānirvāṇa-tantra* (ed. by J. Vidyāsāgara, Calcutta, 1884, 3. 56), which repeats *Bhagavadgītā* 4.24 :

ब्रह्मार्पणं ब्रह्महविर्ब्रह्मानी ब्रह्मणा हुतम् ।

ब्रह्मैव तेन गन्तव्यं ब्रह्मकर्मसमाधिना ॥

9. Cf. *Paramasamhitā*, edit. by S. K. Aiyangar, Baroda, 1940, 18. 12.

10. Cf. *Śvetāśvatara-upaniṣad*, 4. 19cd :

न तस्य प्रतिमा अस्ति यस्य नाम महद्यशः ।

reality of the *mūrti* is, therefore, not taken primarily into consideration, but rather the whole attention is directed to making clear this idea in the mind of the *sādhaka*. For example, the passage quoted above from the *Viṣṇudharmottara-purāṇa* goes on to say :

प्रादुर्भाविगतो विष्णुर्यथा देवगणास्तथा ।

आवाहितः सन्निहितो भवतीति विनिश्चयः ॥¹¹

In *Pratna-saṁhitā*, Viṣṇu promises to be present with his own *śakti* in that image which is consecrated and worshipped by a knower of *Veda* and *Vedāṅga*, that is to say by a man who has the *adhikāra* for it.¹² Moreover, many passages speak of God's being "invoked" (*āvāhitaḥ*)¹³ or "established" (*sthāpitaḥ*)¹⁴ in the *mūrti* or *pratimā*. According to *Hayasīrṣapāñcarātra*, there are even external signs that reveal Kṛṣṇa's presence in an image: the image becomes light and bright and shows an expression of joy.¹⁵

11. *Viṣṇudharmottara-p.*, 3. 108. 9. Also in *śloka-s* 7, 13, 22, 24 of the same *adhyāya* the presence of God in a form is clearly asserted. Cf. also *Agni-purāṇa*, edit. by B. Upādhyāya, Vārāṇasī, 1966, 60. 29ab :

यात्रावर्षादिकं दृष्ट्वा ज्ञेयः सन्निहितो हरिः ।

12. पूजयेद्यदि मद्बिम्बं वेदवेदाङ्गपारगः ।

गृहे वापि प्रतिष्ठाप्य नित्यं पूजयते यदि ॥

अहं तद्बिम्बमाविश्य भक्तानामिष्टसाधकः ।

त्वया सह भविस्यामि नात्र संदेहो अस्तु ते ॥

Śrī Prasna-saṁhitā, edit. by S. Padmanabham, Tirupati, 1969, 4. 10-11. Cf. also *Varāha-purāṇa* (Venkatesvara, Bombay, 1923) :

आगमिष्याम्यहं देवि मन्त्रपाठो मम प्रियः । (182, 16ab)

and एवं कृते विधाने भवामि सन्निहितः स्वयम् । (182, 20ab)

13. For example in *Bhāgavata-purāṇa*, 11. 27. 19 (Gorakhpur, 1968).
14. For example in *Parama-saṁhitā*, 4. 61 and 19. 1.
15. See R. V. JOSHI, *Le rituel de la devotion kṛṣṇaite*, Pondichery, 1959, p. 83. Also J. N. BANERJEA, in *Development of Hindu Iconography*, Delhi, 1974 (III ed.), p. 69 quotes a passage of *Śaḍvīmśa Brāhmaṇa* in which it is said that gods' images laugh, cry, dance etc. Cf. also *Rāmacarita-mānasa* (Gorakhpur, n. d.), 1. 235ff. where the statue of Gaurī smiles and speaks with Sītā.

There may seem to be a contradiction between the texts cited in the last paragraph and those cited earlier. On the one hand the divine presence in the *mūrti* is clearly affirmed, and on the other this presence is described only as a means of satisfying the *bhakti* of the devotees, a device used by God to attract them and facilitate their meditation.¹⁶ But under this apparent contradiction, we can discover two different points of view: one is that of the devotee, who uses the *mūrti* because he needs this means of reaching the One who is *Amṛta*; the other is that of the *yogin* who sees the Supreme *Brahman* in everything, and for whom the *āvāhana* and *visarjana* have no significance because they cannot modify the Supreme Omnipresence he has realized in his own heart. He "sees Śiva in the *Ātman* and not in the *pratimā-s*."¹⁷ These two points of view are not incompatible, and it is possible to find them in close proximity as we have seen in *Viṣṇudharmottara-purāṇa*. In fact, the second point of view represents the ultimate goal, while the first one is only a means, an intermediate stage, as the worship of the *mūrti* has a value only "until one has realized in his own heart the Lord present in all beings":

अर्चिदावर्चयेत् तावदीश्वरं मां स्वकर्मकृत् ।

यावन्न वेद स्वहृदि सर्वभूतेष्ववस्थितम् ॥¹⁸

Worshipping the *mūrti* can be compared with learning the alphabet, which must precede the overall comprehension of a text: in the same way, a man starts worshipping God in his different images, following his own faith and *bhakti* and according to his stage

16. Cf. *Śiva-purāṇa* (Venkatesvara, Bombay, 1965), *Koṭīru-drasamhitā*, 42. 9ab : व्यानार्थं चैव सर्वेषामरूपो रूपवानभूत् । Cf. also *Bhāgavata-p.*, 5. 25. 10 and *Mahānirvāṇa-tantra*, 4. 16-17 and 13. 4, 13.

17. शिवमात्मनि पश्यन्ति प्रतिमासु न योगिनः । *Jabaladarsana-upaniṣad*, 4. 59 ab (in : *Upaniṣatsamgrahaḥ*, Patna, 1970). Cf. also *Liṅga-purāṇa* (ed. by J. Vidyāsāgara, Calcutta, 1885), 1. 74. 30 and 1. 75. 18-22; *Śiva-p.*, *Rudrasamhitā*, 1.12.50-54; *Kūrma-purāṇa* (ed. by A. S. Gupta, Vārāṇasī, 1971), 11.98.20.

18. *Bhāgavata-p.*, 3. 29. 25. Cf. also *Śiva-p.*, *Rudrasamhitā*, 1. 12. 63-67; *Agni-p.*, 379. 31-32; *Liṅga-p.*, 1. 75. 20. The same idea is clearly expressed also in *Maitry-upaniṣad*, 4.6.

of spiritual evolution, in order to reach the highest stage in which he sees Him as the *Ātman* present in all beings.¹⁹

This fact, however, does not justify a merely symbolic interpretation of those scriptural passages which speak of the divine presence, called in the *mūrti* through *āvāhana*. Even if the *yogin's* point of view is superior to the devotee's, it does not remove the validity of the latter. It is certainly a relative validity, but only as devotion to a personal God is relative in comparison to the realization of Brahman. In the vedantic terminology we can say that the *yogin's* perspective is *pāramārthika*, while the devotee's is *vyāvahārika*.²⁰

In the devotional perspective, worship of the *mūrti* has an important but rather limited place on the stairway of spiritual evolution that leads to *mokṣa*. Nevertheless this does not preclude the possibility that the limited horizons of this worship may suddenly open up, permitting the devotee to grasp the vision of the All-pervading Absolute. This experience is often represented in the *Purāṇas*. It is the moment when the devotee becomes aware of the fact that the Divinity which he invokes and adores in the image is only the manifestation of that Absolute. Thus in the *āvāhana* formula itself we sometimes find the mixed and harmonious devotion to the Lord present in a particular way in the *mūrti*, and the aware-

19. अर्चादिषु यदा यत्र श्रद्धा मां तत्र चार्चयेत् ।

सर्वभूतेष्वात्मनि च सर्वात्माहमवस्थितः ॥

(*Bhāgavata-p.*, 11. 27. 48)

यत्र तत्र यथा भक्तिः कर्तव्यं पूजनादिकम् ।

(*Śiva-p.*, *Rudrasaṃhitā*, 1. 12. 69ab).

Notice that in *Garuḍapurāṇa* (edit. by R. Bhattacharya, Vārāṇasī, 1964), 44. 12-13, one is led to the meditation on *Ātman-Brahman* just during the contemplation of a Viṣṇu's image.

20. It may be interesting to see what Śaṅkarācārya says in connection with the problem we are dealing with. Commenting the scriptural statements speaking of God's presence in a particular place (such as in the heart or in the *śālagrāma*), he compared Him with the space that, although omnipresent, is said to abide in the eye of a needle, from the point of view of its association with the needle. But from the *pāramārthika* point of view a limited dwelling cannot be attributed to the *Brahman* (who has no relation with the unreal world). Cf. *Brahmasūtra-śaṅkara*, 1. 2. 7.

ness of the divine Omnipresence : "I will invoke that Spirit who pervades the twenty-five *tattva-s*, the Consciousness, the Supreme Beatitude who is situated in the heart, beginning from *Brahmā* to the blade of grass. From the heart, O Supreme Lord, remain steady in the image which is *pratimā*."²¹

It is important to stress that generally it is not the Supreme *Brahman* who is invoked to become present in the sacred image.²² The Object of the *āvāhana*, the "call", if not one of the many gods who, according to *Viṣṇudharmottara-purāṇa* (3.108.2-3), enter the statue by their own *siddhi-s*, is *Īvara* or *Īśa*, that is the Supreme Lord who can be identified alternately with *Śiva*, *Viṣṇu*, the *Devī*—the *Īṣṭa-devatā* to whom the *bhakta*'s devotion is turned. The fact that it is not the *Brahman* but *Īvara* who "descends" into the *mūrti* is comprehensible in the light of two considerations. The first one concerns the *sādhaka* and consists in the fact, as already mentioned, that he who has realized the *Brahman* does not need *mūrti* worship anymore. The second one is, so to speak, of a "theological" character, and concerns the *Brahman* who is unmanifested (*avyakta*) and *nirguṇa* by his own nature. What manifests itself is *Īvara*, who gives rise to the world, supports it, destroys it and manifests Himself in the *avatāra-s*. Of course, in reading the *Purāṇa-s*, it is necessary to bear in mind that, from

21. जीवमावाहयिष्यामि पञ्चविंशतितत्त्वगम् ॥

चैतन्यं परमानन्दं....

अह्नादिस्तम्बपर्यन्तं हृदयेषु व्यवस्थितम् ।

हृदयात् प्रतिमाविम्बे स्थिरो भव परेश्वर ॥

(*Agni-p.*, 60. 19cd-21)

Also in *Viṣṇudharmottara-p.*, 3. 102, we find an *āvāhana*'s formula very similar to this one : आवाहयाम्यहं जीवं जीजं सर्वगतं प्रभुम् ।... Cf. also *Varāha-p.*, 182. 9 and 186. 11.

22. There are surely a few passages from which we can infer just the opposite. For example in the passage of *Agni-p.* following the above quotation, it is written :

ज्योतिर्ज्ञानं परं ब्रह्म एकमेवाद्वितीयकम् ।

सजीवीकरणं कृत्वा प्रणवेन निबोधयेत् ॥ (60.23)

But this fact is explained by the identification of *Viṣṇu*, invoked in the statue, with the *Brahman* (see below).

their dovotional perspective, the *Iṣṭa-devatā* has very often been so exalted as to be identified with the *Brahman* itself,²³ therefore in the *Iṣṭa-devatā* the characteristics of *Īvara* and *Brahman* are coexisting.

In order to fully understand the problem of the *mūrti* we are dealing with, it is important to examine how the idea of divine manifestation in a definite form has been developed in the puranic literature. In the Supreme One two forms are distinguished : *para* and *apara*, *amūrtā* and *mūrtā*²⁴ : the first one is unmanifested and can be neither seen nor known by the common man, nor even by gods, and all the more it cannot be used as a support for meditation nor be the object of religious practices²⁵; the second one is the "form of Bhagavat having a *mūrti*" (मूर्तं भगवतो रूपम्, *Viṣṇu-p.*, 6.7.78a), the same *mūrti* that "abides in the *avatāra-s*" (अवतारेषु या मूर्तिर्विहरेत्, *Garuḍa-p.*, 1.226.32 cd) and hence can be contemplated, worshipped, "invoked" by men. In this connection also the *Parama-saṃhitā* (3.5-7) very clearly affirms that only he who is endowed with a *mūrti* (*mūrtimān*) can be taken as an object of *pūjā* by a devotee but he who is *Nirākāra* can be reached neither through acts of worship nor with praising hymns, nor even by

23. Cf. for example, *Śiva-p.*, *Rudrasaṃhitā*, 41. 42 : *Garuḍa-p.*, 1. 1. 12; *Bhāgavata-p.*, 11. 16. 1; *Līṅga-p.*, 1. 95. 22 where Śiva, Viṣṇu, Kṛṣṇa and Nṛsiṃha are identified with the *Brahman*. Cf. also above n. 22.

24. मूर्तमूर्तं परम्ब्रह्म । (*Agni-p.*, 347. 9c;
द्वे रूपे ब्रह्मणस्तस्य मूर्तं चामूर्तमेव च । *Viṣṇu-purāṇa* (Gorakhpur, 1969), 1. 22. 55ab;

आश्रयश्चेतसो ब्रह्म द्विषा तच्च स्वभावतः ।

भूप मूर्तममूर्तं च परं चापरमेव च ॥ *ibidem*, 6. 7. 47.

A clear definition of *para* and *apara* is found in *Bṛhannārādīya-purāṇa* (edit. by H. Shastri, Vārāṇasī, 1975 (IIed.)), 31. 57-59.

25. Cf. *Devī Bhāgavata* (edit. by R. T. Pandey, Kāśī, 1969), 3. 8. 19-20; *Bhaviṣya-purāṇa* (Veṅkateśvara, Bombay, 1959), 1. 149. 19; *Garuḍa-p.*, 1. 226. 33.

dhyāna.²⁶ The *Viṣṇu-purāṇa* says that *yogin-s* also, in the beginning of their yogic practice, concentrate on the "Mūṛta" One.²⁷

In such a context, of course, the term "mūṛti" is not used in the narrow sense of a sacred image or *pratimā*, but with its wider etymologic meaning, i.e. something that has assumed a form or a consistency, a "concretion", "personification", "manifestation".²⁸ Here we really find the key to understanding the doctrinal basis from which faith in God's presence in the sacred image finds its justification. In fact, when the term *mūṛti* is connected with *avatāra*, as in the above quoted passage,²⁹ it is just to convey something very similar to what happens in the *avatāra*: in both cases the *Amūṛta* One takes a *mūṛti*, that is to say, He becomes concrete, manifests Himself, assumes a form, "descending" into a body or, in our case, into a *pratimā*. How God can become present in the image surely remains mysterious, but this is not a greater and more inexplicable mystery than the *avatāra*: here and there

26. The same idea is also expressed in *Viṣṇudharmottara-p.*, 3. 46. 3cd-6ab :

पूजाध्यानादिकं कर्तुं साकारस्यैव शक्यते ॥
स्वतस्तु देवः साकारः पूजनीयो यथाविधि ।
अव्यक्ता हि गतिर्दुःखं देहभृद्भिरवाप्यते ॥
अतो भगवत्तानेन स्वेच्छया यत्प्रदर्शितम् ।
प्रादुर्भविव्यथाकारं तदर्चन्ति दिवौकसः ॥
एतस्मात् कारणात् पूजा साकारस्य विधीयते ।
cf. also *Viṣṇu-p.*, 6. 7. 55.

27. मूर्तं यद्योगिभिः पूर्वं योगारम्भेषु चिन्त्यते । (1. 22. 61cd)
28. In this general meaning, the term *mūṛti* is often used simply to signify the different aspects of God, as Śiva's *Aṣṭamūṛti* (cf. *Linga-p.*, 2. 19. 1ff.; *Śiva-p.*, *Śatarudra-saṁhitā*, 2 and *Vāyaṁīya-saṁhitā*, 2. 3. 18ff.) or a particular form in which He manifests Himself or is worshipped by his devotees (for example in *Agni-p.*, 379. 6b; *Bhaviṣya-p.*, 1. 4. 195 and 1.154. 15-20). Also remark that *mūṛta* and *amūṛta* are often synonymous of *saguṇa* and *nirguṇa*, as in *Agni-p.*, 274. 9c; *Viṣṇu-p.*, 1. 22. 55b and 6. 7. 47c.
29. *Garuḍa-p.*, 226. 32.

the infinite bends itself towards the finite to meet the man.³⁰ The question of how this manifestation or “descent” can take place is very often posed in the *Purāṇa*-s, and the answer is always the same : the Absolute manifests Himself for the sake of the world, to meet the needs of his devotees, to attract them to Himself.³¹ The *Bhāgavata-purāṇa* even says that He “puts on a *mūrti* for our sake, impelled by his great compassion”.³² The problem then remains unsolved because it is constantly shifted from the “how” to the “why”. Therefore, we have to accept the fact that it is impossible to pry into the impenetrable depths of this divine mystery in order to understand how the presence of the Without-Form can exist in the limited form of the image. By examining the Scriptures, however, we can find out in which ways this divine presence becomes actual and which are the terms that can define it.

First of all, let us observe that such a Presence depends on a series of definite and objective conditions, in the absence of which the Divinity does not descend into the *mūrti*. The first of these conditions concerns the *mūrti* itself while the second one concerns the celebration of its consecratory rites.

As is well known, the *mūrti* must conform to some defined iconographic models which establish its posture, the

30. It is interesting to notice that the verb “*ava-tṛ*”, in its causative form, is also used to mean the Divinity’s descent in the *mūrti* during the *āvāhana*, for example in *Kālikā-purāṇa* (edit. by V. N. Shastri, Vārāṇasī, 1972), 58. 135 ab. The idea of the connection between *mūrti* and *avatāra* has been doctrinally developed by the *Pāñcarātra*-s. They call the sacred image “*arcāvatāra*”, term explained by O. Schrader as “incarnation for the purpose of ordinary worship”. God, descending with his *śakti* in the *arcāvatāra*, becomes present there with a subtle body, just as in the physical bodies of the *avatāra*-s. See O. SCHRADER, *Introduction to the Pāñcarātra and the Ahirbudhnyā Samhitā*, Madras, 1916, pp. 48-49.

31. Cf. for example *Śiva-p.*, *Koṭirudrasamhitā*, 1. 15-17 and *Mahānirvāṇa-tantra*, 4. 16-17 and 13. 2-13.

32. मूर्ते नः पुरुषपया बभार सत्त्वं संशुद्धं सदसदिदं विभाति यत्र ।

यत्कलीकं मृगपतिराददेऽनवद्यामादातुं स्वजनमनांस्युदारवीर्यः ॥

number and the position of its limbs, the emblems etc., because every peculiar aspect of the image has to be in accordance with a determinate aspect of the Divinity. Besides that, iconometric canons are also given which fix the proportions of the image up to the smallest detail.³³ The *Purāṇa-s* exhort the observance of all the rules prescribed in the *śāstra-s* on this subject and threaten whoever makes or owns an image which is not in accordance with the prescribed canons with every kind of evil and mishap.³⁴ And the threat goes even further: according to the *Viṣṇudharmottara-purāṇa*, "the gods, even if called by the best of the Brahmans, do not inhabit the *pratimā* that is lacking in *pramāṇa-s* and *lakṣaṇa-s*", i.e. that has not the required iconographic characteristics, "on the contrary *Piśāca-s*, *Daiṭya-s*, *Dānava-s* enter it".³⁵ There-

33. The best and the most complete study on this subject is perhaps the already quoted book of J. N. BANERJEA, *The Development of Hindu Iconography*, especially chs. VII to XII.

34. Cf. for example *Matsya-purāṇa* (edit. by J. Vidyāsāgara, Calcutta, 1876), 258. 15-21 and 261. 19. Of course these ideas appear more often in the technical literature. See *Brhat-saṃhitā*, 57. 49-55 and *Pratimāmānalakṣaṇa*, 2. 78-84 (both the texts are edited and translated by J. N. BANERJEA, *op. cit.*, pp. 579-617). The *Sukranīti* clearly states.

यथोक्तावयवैः पूर्णा पुण्यदा सुमनोहरा ॥

अन्यथाऽऽयुर्धनहरा नित्यं दुःखविवर्द्धनी ।

(edit. by B. Miśra, Vārāṇasī, 1968, 4. 4. 76cd-77ab)

35. प्रमाणहीनां प्रतिमां तथा लक्षणवर्जिताम् ॥

आवाहितापि विप्रेन्द्रैर्नाविशन्ति दिवौकसः ।

आविशन्ति तु तां नित्यं पिशाचा दैत्यदानवाः ॥ (3. 38. 22cd-23)

Cf. also *Parama-saṃhitā*, 19. 9. Notice that the same bad consequences that have been mentioned before, as well as the Divinity's departure from the *mūrti* can take place if the *mūrti* breaks, burns or comes into contact with impure things, in which case the *mūrti* must be replaced by a new one through specific rites, or, according to the cases, the consecratory rites must be repeated. See *Agni-p.*, 67; *Parama-saṃhitā*, 22. 74; *Pratimāmānalakṣaṇa*, 2. 131-134. Also see J. N. BANERJEA, *op. cit.*, pp. 568-571 and P. V. KANE, *History of Dharmasāstra*, Poona, 1968-1977 (II ed.), vol. II, pt. II, pp. 904-906.

fore, *pramāṇa-s* and *lakṣaṇa-s* are so important that, if they are absent, even the consecratory rites are ineffective. In fact, the gods refuse to enter that *mūrti*, leaving free passage to demoniacal presence. By the way, it is necessary to note that the texts do not always take such a rigid position; according to some texts, for example, the exactitude of the proportions is required only for the immovable *mūrti-s* and for the *mūrti-s* of the temples. Furthermore, according to those texts and those passages in which the devotional view assumes more importance than the ritualist one, the devotee's *bhakti* can make up for any deficiency in the form of the *mūrti* and of the rites.³⁶

Nevertheless, one is led to ask oneself about the significance of a conception according to which the good result of worship and even the divine presence in the *mūrti* are conditioned by the conformity of the *mūrti* to iconographic rules. This fact requires a closer examination and it could be by itself an object of separate study. For the moment, let us limit ourselves to a single remark: the *mūrti*, as Danielou has observed³⁷, is the concretization of certain divine aspects and cosmic forces, just like a *maṇḍala* or a *yantra*, but in a less abstract form which is, therefore, more approachable by the common man. This idea in itself is sufficient for us to understand that it is not possible to leave the Divinity's representation to individual inspiration or imagination, because every single part of the *mūrti* has precise cosmic references that

36. The wonderful story, related in the *Bhaktamāla*, of *sant* Dhana is significant. Dhana, by the power of his simple devotion, invoked in a stone the presence of God who manifested Himself and even ate the offerings of food presented to Him. Cf. *Bhaktamāla*, Lucknow, 1977 (XVI ed.), pp. 522-524.

37. See A. DANIELOU, *op. cit.*, p. 332. See also G. RAO, *Elements of Hindu Iconography*, Vārāṇasī, 1971 (II ed.), pp. 27-28; G. TUCCI, *Teoria e pratica del mandala*, Roma, 1969, p. 89; S. N. DASGUPTA, *Fundamentals of Indian Art*, Bombay, 1960 (II ed.), p. 25.

cannot be confused or left out.³⁸ Besides this, even if the absolute precision necessary in the *maṇḍala* is not required for the *mūrti*, the sacred image is nevertheless a ritual support, and its importance is particularly great because it is destined to become the dwelling of the Divinity; that's why in a *mūrti*, as in a rite, even the smallest detail has a great importance. When the Divinity is called upon to come and dwell in the *mūrti*, that *mūrti* must be as suitable as possible for its reception; that is, it must be in the greatest possible conformity with the form (*svarūpa*) of that particular Divinity, as described in the Scriptures.³⁹ Then the *mūrti* can truly be considered a "concretization", a visible manifestation of the invisible Divinity dwelling in it.

As regards the performance of consecratory rites, all the external conditions of time and place should be carefully taken into consideration. According to *Parama-saṃhitā*, 19.2, for example, the good result of the *sthāpana* of a *mūrti* depends on the good or bad conditions of the place (*deśa*), of the time (*kāla*)⁴⁰, of the people (*puruṣa*) and of the temple (*prāsāda*). Among the required conditions, the celebrant's *adhikāra* has a special im-

38. The *Purāṇa*-s are rich in passages concerning the interpretation of these symbols. Special attention must be given to the III *khaṇḍa* of *Viṣṇudharmottara p.* in which there is much relevant material on this subject, especially from *adhyāya* 44 to 85. Here we can find not only the description of *pratimā lakṣaṇa*-s, but also their symbolical meaning for which the technical term *hetu* is used.

39. Cf. *Hayagrīva Pāñcarātra*, quoted by J. N. BANERJEA, *op. cit.*, p. 82: *ābhirūpyacca bimbānāṃ deśaḥ sānnidhyam rocchati*, where "ābhirūpyat" has to be understood as the "fit, suitable form". The same passage also appears in the *Tithyāditattoam*, quoted by *Śabdakalpādruma*, sub *roc* in the "sānnidhyam", where not only the adaptability of the image, but also the worshipper's *tapas* and the 'perfection of the act of worship are stressed.

40. In the texts there are many prescriptions about the choice of the proper time, the *muhūrta*, which is very important for the celebration of the consecratory rites (and for many other rites as well). A selection of *śloka*-s on this subject is found in VENIRAMA ŚARMA GAUDA, *Tajña-mīmāṃsā*, *Vārāṇasī*, 1970, pt. I, pp. 503 ff.

portance too⁴¹. The ceremony through which the Divinity becomes present in the sacred image (*sānnidhyakaraṇa*) is the centre of a series of rites called "*prāṇa-pratiṣṭhā*", culminating in the *āvāhana* which is the essential part of it. These rites can continue for many days and they are sometimes performed with great pomp and solemnity.⁴² However, they can also be reduced to a few gestures or even to the *āvāhana* alone, as is the case of a little domestic *mūrti*, whose *prāṇa-pratiṣṭhā* can be repeated every day before the daily *pūjā* or during every act of worship.⁴³ Generally the Scriptures distinguish between two kinds of *mūrti*: the *cala* and the *acala*. In the first case, the worshipper can repeat at will the *āvāhana* and the *visarjana* before and after every *pūjā*, but *āvāhana* and *visarjana* are compulsory if the statue has been moved. In the second case, the *āvāhana* is performed once and for all in the moment of placing the *mūrti* in a temple or in its fixed seat.⁴⁴

Moreover, there are two fundamental kinds of *prāṇa-pratiṣṭhā*: the vedic and tantric. In the *Tantra-s*, we can find many descriptions of *prāṇa-pratiṣṭhā*, but still a great part of tantric ritual remains secret, especially as far as formulas and *mantra-s* are concerned. The reason is, in fact, that the tantric ritual, just as the magic ritual, sets forces in motion which only the initiates are able to control. Thus even a small mistake in gesture or in the pronunciation of a syllable can be fatal for whoever performs the rite. Different local traditions are rich in anecdotes regarding this subject: thus disciples are said to have been stricken by great misfor-

41. Cf. *Matsya-p.*, 254.264 and 264. 1cd ff.

42. Such were the rites for the consecration of a new statue of Annapūrṇā in Vārāṇasī in January 1977. The *prāṇa-pratiṣṭhā* was patronized by the Śringerī's Śaṅkarācārya, His Holiness Śrī Abhinava Vidyātīrtha Svāmin, who for the occasion had the *Caṇḍī-yajña* and the *Rudra-yajña* celebrated. They continued for about one week, with the participation of 212 *paṇḍita-s*.

43. Cf. for example *Agni-p.*, 74.55 and *Parama-saṁhitā*, 27.22. Note that *āvāhana* and *visarjana* must be performed also in the mental *pūjā-s*, like in the *pūjā* described in *Parama-saṁhitā*, 4. 24-26.

44. Cf. *Bhāgavata-p.*, 11.27.13-14. According to *Parama-saṁhitā*, 23. 26ab in the case of a movable statue, *āvāhana* and *visarjana* must be compulsorily repeated every time :
अङ्गं वास्त्वयेन्नित्यमावाह्यं च विसृज्य च ।

tune or by death for having uttered secret *mantra*-s, which they have extorted from the *Guru* before being able to use them, and for suddenly finding themselves in face-to-face dangerous contact with the presence of the Divinity which they have invoked.

The second kind of *prāṇa-pratiṣṭhā* is widely described in the *Purāṇa*-s and *Āgama*-s and is called "vedic". This does not mean that it dates back to vedic times—whether or not the *mūrti* cult existed in vedic times is still a topic of debate⁴⁵—but it means that in this kind of *prāṇa pratiṣṭhā* mostly vedic *mantra*-s and vedic rituals are used. Nevertheless the distinction between vedic and tantric *prāṇa-pratiṣṭhā* is not completely rigid: it is well known that in the *Purāṇa*-s there are plenty of tantric ideas⁴⁶ and the vedic ritual of *prāṇa-pratiṣṭhā* that we are going to examine is also full of tantric elements. The vedic and tantric rituals are often mixed especially in Bengal, where the famous *Durgā-pūjā* is full of tantric elements. On the other hand, the sanction for this mixing is provided by the *Purāṇa*-s. In fact the *Bhāgavata-purāṇa* enumerates three kinds of rituals: vedic, tantric and mixed rituals⁴⁷. In South India, however, vedic and tantric rituals remain almost completely distinct.

As we said, the *prāṇa-pratiṣṭhā* includes a great number of ritual acts: the bath of the statue which must be performed under an apposite *maṇḍapa*, its unction with perfumes and sandal paste, the consecration of *kalāṣa*, the *homa*, the offerings of food, water and flowers and also other rites that, with few variants, appear in all the *Purāṇa*-s dealing with this subject⁴⁸. Among these rites, the most relevant to our study are those

45. J. N. Banerjea has given a wide outline of this debate: *op. cit.*, pp. 41 ff. See also S. L. Varmā, *op. cit.*, pp. 5 ff. and G. Rao, *op. cit.*, pp. 4-5.

46. See C. Chakravarti, *Tantras—Studies on their Religion and Literature*, Calcutta, 1972 (rep.), p. 80 and B. Upādhyāya, *Purāṇa Vimarśa*, Vārāṇasī, 1965, pp. 448 ff.

47. See *Bhāgavata-p.*, II. 27. 7ab :

वैदिकस्तान्त्रिको मिश्र इति मे त्रिविधो मन्त्रः ।

48. The two more classic *Purāṇa*-s in this matter are the *Agni-p.* (*adhyāya*-s 59, 60, 62, 63, 66) and the *Matsya-p.* (*adhyāya* 263-265), but also see *Garuda-p.*, 48; *Bhāgavata-p.*, II. 27; *Śiva-p.*, *Vāyaṇīyasamhitā*, *Uttarabhāga*, 36. The āgamic and tantric literatures are also very rich in ritual

performed on the *mūrti*, especially the *āvāhana* because by examining them we can understand the relation between the Divinity and the *mūrti*, and consequently, the way in which the Divinity is present in it.

First of all, it should be noted that many of those *prāṇa-pratiṣṭhā* rites which aim at preparing the image for the God's descent may be regarded as normal acts of purification and worship. Such acts are usually performed with all the sacred or sacred-related objects⁴⁹, but of course in the case of *prāṇa-pratiṣṭhā* they take on a greater importance and solemnity. Some other rites have a more specific character and, between these, *nyāsa* is particularly important. During the *prāṇa-pratiṣṭhā*, the officiant performs *nyāsa* upon himself, then repeats it upon the *mūrti*. The reason for this lies in the fact that the celebrant cannot consecrate the *mūrti* and invoke in it the Divinity (and not even do a *pūjā*) unless he has performed the same rituals upon himself, thus identifying himself with that Divinity (*ātmaprāṇa-pratiṣṭhā*), so that he simply communicates to the image that particular divine presence which he has first evoked in himself.⁵⁰ In the *Purāṇa-s*

prescriptions for the consecration of the *mūrti-s* (see for example *Parama-saṃhitā*, 18-19 and *Mahānirvāṇa-tantra*, 12). The technical work of Nīlakaṇṭha Bhaṭṭa, *Pratiṣṭhā-mayūkha* (edited by Daulatarām Gauḍa, Vārāṇasī, 1971) should be noticed together with a few pages of *Nirṇaya-sindhu* (Bombay, 1949) in which we can find some of the *prāṇa-pratiṣṭhā* formulas very commonly used till now.

49. In the same way, for instance, all the vessels must be purified and worshipped with flowers or anointed with sandal paste before being used in a *pūjā*. Even the hand with which one brings flowers in the temple for offering must be purified with water.
50. Cf. *Agni-p.*, 59.1 ff.; *Matsya-p.*, 265.34-35; *Garuḍa-p.*, 31, 10-12; 48,49; *Bhāgavata-p.*, 11.27.19; *Parama-saṃhitā*, 19.59. G. Chakravarti (*op. cit.*, p. 80) rightly sees in this fact a tantric influence. However there is certainly an influence from that traditional idea so well expressed by the saying नान्यो देवमर्चयेत् "No one can worship God, if he is not God". This purely advaitic idea is supported by the authority of *Upaniṣad-s.* (see *Bṛhadāraṇyaka-up.*, 1.4.10: योऽन्यं देवतामुपास्तेऽन्योऽसावन्योऽहमस्मीति न स वेद) and also appears in many *Purāṇa-s*. Cf., for example, *Śiva-p.*, *Vāyaṇīyasamhitā*, *Uttarabhāga*, 22.42 cd-43 ab:

different kinds of *nyāsa* are mentioned : Divinities, abstract symbols, the sun, the Indian rivers, etc can be "placed" on the different parts of the *mūrti*. All these concrete or abstract entities are generally symbolized by means of sacred syllables which the priest visualizes as being put on the eyes, on the limbs, on the heart, on the navel, etc. of the *pratimā*. The more meaningful and commonly used of these *nyāsa*-s is certainly the one in which the priest mentally places the various *tattva*-s on different parts of the statue, such as *prāṇa*, *buddhi*, *ahamkāra*, *manas*, *tanmātra*-s, *mahābhūta*-s and all the *tattva*-s which, according to *Sāṃkhya*, constitute the manifested universe.⁵¹ For this reason it is spontaneous to compare the *nyāsa* and the act of the *sṛṣṭi*, all the more so because, according to *Agni-purāṇa*, 67.2, these *tattva*-s must be reabsorbed with the *samhāra* rite at the moment of *visarjana*, just as the *tattva*-s of the universe will be reabsorbed in the moment of *pralaya*.

The *mūrti* is cosmicized with the *nyāsa*, before receiving in itself the divine presence, and thus it is mystically transformed into a microcosm; this microcosm is considered as a living organism and, therefore, is similar to the man who is himself a microcosm.⁵² In fact, also the sensory faculties of the *mūrti* have to be

नाशिवः शिवमम्यस्येन्नाशिवः शिवमर्चयेत् ।

नाशिवस्तु शिवं व्यायेन्नाशिवः प्राप्नुयाच्छिवम् ॥

and 26. 13 ab:

येऽर्चयन्ति महादेवं विज्ञेयास्ते महेश्वराः ।

In this connection, these words of *Kālikā-p.* are particularly strong:

देवाधारो ह्यहं देवो देवं देवाय योजयेत् । (57.107)

51. Cf., for example, *Agni-p.*, 59.17 ff. Particularly clear is the *nyāsa*'s formula given in *Nirṇayasindhu*, 3.1, p. 250 and in *Pratiṣṭhāmayūkha*, pp. 150-151.

52. See for example the following passage of *Agni-p.* (59.15-16 ab) which gets strength from the context :

वाकाशवायुतेजांसि सलिलं पृथिवी तथा ।

स्थूलमेभिः शरीरन्तु सर्वाचारं पञ्चायते ॥

एतेषां वाचका मन्त्रा न्यासायोच्यन्त उत्तमाः ।

As regards the "cosmicization" of the *mūrti*, it is worthy of note that one of the *vedic mantra*-s uttered during the *prāṇa-pratiṣṭhā* is the *Puruṣasūkta* (see *Agni-p.*, 59.48 and *Nirṇayasindhu*, 3.1.p. 250).

“roused”: the *Bṛhatsaṃhitā*⁵³ speaks of “rousing” the statue from sleep with songs and dances and one of the most popular hymns sung in Bengal during *Durgā-pūjā*, “*Jāgo Durgā*”, is an invitation to the Devī to “rouse”. Here the rite with which the eyes of the *mūrti* are opened is particularly beautiful and meaningful. The officiant, pronouncing a *mantra*, touches the eyes of the statue with a stick to the top of which a tuft of *kuśa* grass or some flowers are tied and in this way he gives light to the Divinity’s eyes.⁵⁴ Both to touch the cheeks of the statue and to touch its heart are other meaningful gestures and all have the same basic symbolism: infusing life into the *pratimā*, which is directly connected with the significance of *prāṇa-pratiṣṭhā* (the “establishing the life” in the *mūrti*).

देवस्य प्राणा इह प्राणाः....देवस्य जीव इह स्थितः....

Through such words the officiant invokes in the statue the *prāṇa* and *jīva* of the Divinity, and he also invokes the *indriya*-s one by one.⁵⁵ Of course, here a symbolic language is used because the Divinity has not the sense organs, but it well expresses the idea of the “vivification of the image” (*sajīvakaraṇa*). This vivification cannot be considered accomplished until the Divinity invoked by the celebrant descends into the *mūrti* whose senses have been roused and in which life has been infused :

53. Quoted by J. N. BANERJEA, *op. cit.*, pp. 566-567.

54. हिरण्यवर्णां हरिणीं नेत्रे चोन्मीलयेच्छ्रियाः ॥

(*Agni-p.*, 62.3 cd)

मन्त्रोऽयं सर्वदेवानां नेत्रज्योतिष्वपि स्मृतः ।

एवमामन्त्र्य देवेशं काञ्चनेन विलेखयेत् ॥

(*Matsya-p.*, 263.33)

Notice here that a golden stick is said to be used for opening the Divinity’s eyes, like in *Garuḍa-p.*, 48.35-36.

55. Cf. *Nirṇayasindhu*, 3.1, p. 250. This formula, as well as the others, are susceptible of variations in the common use. This fact is testified by the modern *karmakāṇḍa* manuals. See for example, *Karmakāṇḍa Paddhati*, edit. by G. Datta Śāstrī, Mathurā, s. d., p. 166 :

अस्याः देव्याः स्वर्णप्रतिमायां प्राणा इह प्राणाः.....अस्याः देव्याः स्वर्णप्रतिमायां जीवा इह स्थितः.....See also *Sanatkumāra-tantra*, 4.13 and 10.78-80 (in *Tantrasaṃgrahaḥ*, vol. III, edit. by R. Tripāṭhī, Vārāṇasī, 1979, pp. 517-564).

....प्रतिमाबिम्बे स्थिरो भव परेश्वर ।

सजीवं कुरु बिम्बं.....⁵⁶

The *āvāhana* is certainly the most solemn moment of all the *prāṇa-pratiṣṭhā* ceremony, because through *āvāhana* the mystical change in the *mūrti* is fulfilled. In the *Purāṇa*-s many formulas of *āvāhana* are given and some of them are wonderful prayers by which the celebrant invokes God with devotion, asking him to become present in the *pratimā* and identifying Him with the *Paramātman*, with the Supreme Lord, Omnipresent and All-pervading, Creator and Sustainer of all things.⁵⁷ But usually, the *āvāhana* is performed by uttering a short *mantra* which varies depending on whether the *mūrti* is *cala* or *acala*. If the *mūrti* is *acala*, the Divinity is invoked to remain in the *pratimā* for ever, "till the sun and the moon"⁵⁸ exist. If the *mūrti* is *cala*, the Divinity is requested to stay in it for the whole time of the *pūjā*.⁵⁹ Among the stereotyped formulas used for *āvāhana* of different Divinities, the formula quoted by the *Nirṇayasindhu* is one of the most often used, appearing with few variants in many manuals of *karmakāṇḍa*⁶⁰ :

अस्यै प्राणाः प्रतिष्ठन्तु अस्यै प्राणाः क्षरन्तु च ।

अस्यै देवत्वमर्चयि मामहेति च कच्चन ॥⁶¹

56. *Agni-p.*, 40.21-cd 22a. Cf. also *Saṃskārapaddhatiḥ* by BHĀSKARA, Poona, 1924, p. 29 : इति मन्त्रमुक्त्वा प्रतिमां सजीवां ध्यायेत् ।

57. Cf. for example *Viṣṇudharmottara-p.*, 3.102; *Varāha-p.*, 185. 10-17; *Agni-p.*, 60.19-23.

58. So it is said in the wellknown formula :

सूर्याचन्द्रमसौ यावद्यावत्तिष्ठति मेदिनी ।

तावत्त्वयाऽत्र देवेश स्थातव्यं स्वेच्छया प्रभो ॥

(*Pratiṣṭhāmayūkha*, p. 157)

59. For example, this is the formula used in the *āvāhana* of a *cala liṅga* : स्वामिन् सर्वजगन्नाथ यावत् पूजावसानम् । तवत् त्वं लिङ्गरूपेण अत्रैव सन्निधौ भव ॥

60. See for example in V. ŚARMĀ GAUḌA, *Durgāpūjana-paddhatiḥ*, Vārāṇasī, 1977, p. 8 and in V. N. MĪSRA, *Grahaṇa-prayogaḥ arthāt grahaśāntiḥ*, Kāśī, 1945, p. 9

61. *Nirṇayasindhu*, p. 250. In the *Pratiṣṭhāmayūkha* (p. 152), this formula is given with the following variant : अस्यै देवत्वमर्चयि स्वाहेति यजुरीरयेत् ॥ And in *Saṃskārapaddhatiḥ*

After welcoming God who has settled in the *mūrti*, one has to invoke Him again : “O Bhagavat, with that form with which You pervades all the mobile and immobile things, remain present in the sacred images, o Lord of gods !”

येन रूपेण भगवंस्त्वया व्याप्तं चराचरम् ।

तेन रूपेण देवेश स्वार्चायां सन्निधौ भव ॥⁶²

Anyway, it must be pointed out that, although the technical literature and the *Purāṇa*-s themselves are rich in ritual prescriptions and formulas for the *prāṇa-pratiṣṭhā*, all these texts have to be considered incomplete in many cases, and most probably purposely incomplete. We have already mentioned the fact that in tantric rituals many parts remain secret : also in the cases of many other common rites of consecration, the Divinity's name or a particular *mantra* which will henceforth be pronounced during every *pūjā* remain secret. This happens especially in the case of family Divinities (*kula-devatā*) whose secret *mantra* is handed on from father to son and is jealously kept in the narrow family circle, but this *mantra* (or name) remains often secret also in the *prāṇa-pratiṣṭhā* of the *mūrti*-s which are under the care of a *maṭha* or of a religious association and, in this case, it is known only by the *pujāri* of that *maṭha* or of that association. This is because the Divinity's name or the *mantra* has a determinant power in the *āvāhana* and just through it the Divinity is called⁶³. Here is the heart of the matter: what happens during the *āvāhana* ? How can a *mantra* evoke the divine presence ? Figuratively, we could say that when the celebrant invokes God in one of his aspects and asks Him to become present in the *mūrti*, he attunes himself on the wavelength of the Divinity, catches its vibrations and infuses them in the *mūrti*. The instrument which enables him to catch the vibrations of one certain Divinity among many other divine vibrations is its name or its particular *mantra*, which, as its essence, is indivisible from the Divinity itself. In this connection there is all the theology of the

(p. 29) : अस्यै जीवत्वमर्चयै स्वाहा ॥ This formula is also present in the *Kālikā-p.*, according to V. Śarmā Gauḍa, but he specifies neither the *adhyāya* nor the *śloka* (*Tajñā-mīmāṃsā*, p. 513).

62. *Nirṇayasindhu*, 3. 1, p. 250 and *Pratiṣṭhāmayūkha*, p. 156.

63. मन्त्रैराकृष्यते देवो मन्त्रैरेव विसृज्यते ॥ (*Parama-saṃhitā*, 6. 3cd).

Name, especially developed by *vaiṣṇava* movements, according to which in God “*nāma-nāminor abhedah*”.⁶⁴ Moreover, the *mantra* is the essential and enigmatic expression of the same symbolism found in the iconographical form which simply expresses it in a more concrete and explicit way. Therefore, there is a perfect correspondence between the *mantra* and the iconographical form of a certain Divinity because both of them are manifestations of the same divine essence⁶⁵. For this reason in the *prāṇa-pratiṣṭhā* (but also in

64. This doctrine is based on the idea of the eternity of sound and, carried to its extreme consequences, has led to the consideration of God's Name as something greater than God himself, somehow. See S. K. DE, *The Early History of the Vaiṣṇava Faith and Movement in Bengal*, Calcutta, 1961, pp. 486-487 and T. K. VENKATESVARAN, *Radha-Krishna Bhajanas of South India : A Phenomenological, Theological, and Philosophical Study*, in : *Krishna: Myths, Rites and Attitudes*, edit. by M. Singer, Chicago, 1966, p. 169. Also in the *Purāṇa-s* a supreme power is attributed to the Name of God, as the great number of *sahasranāmastotra-s* present in the puranic literature can show. For example let us mention the *Śivasahasranāma*, in *Līṅga-p.*, 1. 98. 27-158, *Śiva-p.*, *Kotirudra Samhitā* 35, the *Viṣṇusahasranāma*, in *Garuḍa-p.*, 1, 15 and *Padma-p.* (Poona, 1894), *Uttarakhaṇḍa*, 72. 113-297, and the *Durgāsahasranāma*, in *Kūrma-p.*, 1.2. 76-216. The importance of the repetition of God's Name is always much stressed and this repetition is said to grant fulfillment of all desires, purification from all sins, the merits one can get from the pilgrimage to all *tīrtha-s* and even *mukti*! Cf. for example *Padma-p.*, *Uttarakhaṇḍa*, 72. 1-110; *Agni-p.*, 305.16; *Līṅga-p.*, 1.44, 48-49; *Śiva-p.*, *Umāsamhitā*, 20. 50-52; *Bhāgavata-p.*, 1. 1. 14; 1. 5. 11; 11. 5. 36-37.

65. See A. DANIELOU, *op. cit.*, p. 332. As is well known, the importance of *mantra* has been stressed especially in the tantrism (see A. AVALON, *op. cit.*, pp. 312 ff.), but also in the *Purāṇa-s* we can find a lot of material about *mantra-s* in their connection with different Divinities especially in *Agni-p.* which dedicates several *adhyāya-s* to this subject (302, 304, 308, 317 etc.).

every *pūjā*) a great importance is given to *mūla-mantra*, which can be translated as “fundamental” or “specific” *mantra* and which is the *mantra* characteristic of a particular Divinity. In this connection the *Agni-purāṇa* (49.37cd-38ab) clearly states that the vivification of that Divinity, whose *sthāpana* has to be made, must be performed through *mūla-mantra* :

अथवा यस्य देवस्य प्रारब्धं स्थापनं भवेत् ॥
तस्यैव मूलमन्त्रेण सजीवकरणं भवेत् ।

When the *prāṇa-pratiṣṭhā* has been accomplished, the *mūrti* can be worshipped or in the case of a temple's *mūrti*, it can be exposed to public veneration. It is very important to stress the fact that before performing the *prāṇa-pratiṣṭhā*, the *mūrti* is only an object like many others; at most it can function as a symbolical reminder as do sacred images in Christianity, but it cannot be an object of worship. All the sacred value of the *mūrti* as the seat of divine presence depends in fact on the *prāṇa-pratiṣṭhā*; thus it is said that if one makes a mistake in pronouncing *mantra*-s or in performing the *prāṇa-pratiṣṭhā* rites, one runs the risk of worshipping a mere stone as Divinity.⁶⁶ This is obviously a far cry from idolatry ! Furthermore, the *Purāṇa*-s explicitly warn the faithful against the *pūjā* of a *mūrti* whose consecration has not yet been performed⁶⁷, because, as we insisted from the very beginning, not the image in itself is worshipped but the Divinity present in it.

There is one more problem regarding this “divine presence”, namely, what is the relationship between the *mūrti* and the Divinity present in it ? Recalling what happens during the *prāṇa-pratiṣṭhā*, we can say that “inhabitation” is perhaps the most suitable term for the definition of this relationship. This term is also suggested when it is constantly affirmed that God becomes present (*sannihita*) in the *mūrti*. Moreover, “*adhivāsana*”, that is “inhabitation”, is the term which is used to describe a part of the *prāṇa-pratiṣṭhā*

66. Cf. *Āryasaptatī*, 386 (quoted in *Śabdakalpadrūma*, sub voce “*pratiṣṭhā*”) :

पूजा विना प्रतिष्ठां नास्ति न मन्त्रं विना प्रतिष्ठा च ।

तदुभयविप्रतिपन्नः पश्यतु गीर्वाणपाषाणम् ॥

67. See the *śloka* quoted by V. S. GAUDA in *Tajña-mīmāṃsā*, p. 513.

rites, which also includes the *āvāhana*.⁶⁸ The term "inhabitation" is, however, imprecise, because the relation between Divinity and *mūrti* cannot be compared to the one between a house and its inhabitants merely. We have seen that the *mūrti* is mystically transformed through *prāṇa-pratiṣṭhā* into a living organism, that the *mūrti* is vivified by the *prāṇa*, the *jīva*, the *indriyas* of the Divinity and that somehow it is regarded as the Divinity's body. A proof is the fact that the *pratimā* is often called by names such as *vapu*, *tanu*, *vera* etc. in the Scriptures. This way of "feeling" the sacred image as the Divinity's body is peculiar especially to the *Pāñcarātra Saṁhitā-s*, which consider the *arcā*, the sacred image object of worship, as one of the five God's manifestations (*vibhava*).⁶⁹ Also the *yantra* which, as we have seen, is somehow an equivalent of the *mūrti*, is often spoken of as a Divinity's body, especially in the *Tantra-s*.⁷⁰ Yet we cannot speak of a perfect union between the Divinity and this "body". In fact, just as God enters the *mūrti* through *āvāhana*, in the same way He leaves it through *visarjana*. Also if any accident befalls the *mūrti*—a fall, a breakage and, according to some sources, even the impure contact with an out-cast—it may result in the God's removal from the *mūrti* as from a habitation that has become unpleasant.⁷¹

Actually, the relationship between Divinity and *mūrti* escapes precise definition; again and again the tradition has stressed the *mūrti* aspects as the Divinity's body or habitation, but this second aspect seems to be more consistent from a doctrinal point of view and on the basis of puranic texts. Perhaps the term that best of all expresses the *mūrti* reality, including both the ideas of habitation and of living organism, is the term "*jīvamandira*" which

68. हरेः सान्निध्यकरणमधिवासनमुच्यते । (*Agni-p.*, 59, 1 ab) Cf. also *Mahānirvāṇa-tantra*, 13. 285 where the *pratimā* is called "*devatāvāsa*" "Divinity's habitation".

69. On the idea of *arcā* in the *Pāñcarātra*'s doctrine, see S. R. BHATT, *The Philosophy of Pancharatra*, Madras, 1968, p. 41 and the articles of M. YAMUNACHARYA, V. VARADACHARI and S. VASUDEVACHARIAR, in *Visishtadvaita Philosophy and Religion*, Madras, 1974, pp. 206-211, p. 240 and p. 258. See also above n. 30.

70. See J. WOODROFFE, *Introduction to Tantra Śāstra*, Madras, 1973 (VI ed.), pp. 92-95 and P. V. KANE, *op. cit.*, vol. V, pt. II, p. 1135.

71. See above n. 35.

appears in *Bhāgavata-purāṇa*, 11.27.13b, and which means “living habitation” or “living temple” of the Divinity.⁷²

We now have many elements for answering the initial problem at least from a puranic point of view. We have seen that the *mūrti* worship has certainly the value of offering psychological aid to the devotee, because the *mūrti* represents a concrete divine form to which he can direct his devotion and meditation. At the same time, *mūrti-pūjā* is only a step towards a higher realization and towards the transcendence of any forms and rites. But to consider the *mūrti* only as a symbol or as a support for meditation is an incomplete view, a disregard of its deepest reality, that is the divine presence, which should not be understood merely as a practical means for the devotee. The divine presence in the *mūrti* is something effective at a mystical level. If we have to use Christian terminology, we could say that it is somehow a “sacramental” presence. God is everywhere, but through the power of the *āvāhana*'s mantra He enters the *mūrti* with his *śakti* and gives to his *bhakta*-s in a very specific way the grace of his presence. Thus we cannot consider *āvāhana* and *visarjana* merely as a “psychological drama” which is played for the purpose of worship in the mind of the *sādhaka*-s : they truly result in a mystical transformation of the *mūrti*, as clearly comes out by examining the ritual and the

72. In this connection is remarkable the similarity between the *mūrti* and the temple which are both inhabited by God and both considered His body, although in a different way. In the ceremony of temple dedication, as described in *Agni-p.*, 101-102, there are analogies with some *prāṇa-pratiṣṭhā* rites. Moreover the *Agni-p.* clearly states that the temple is a kind of *mūrti* : प्रासादं वासुदेवस्य मूर्तिभेदम् (61, 19 cd.) and considers it to be a microcosm and a living organism, just like the *mūrti*. The various characteristics of the temple are linked with the *mahābhūta*-s and its parts with the parts of the human body, while the *pratimā* has the place of the *jīva* (प्रतिमा जीव उच्यते) 61, 20-26). The temple, as the *mūrti*, is the instrument through which God is present in the world in a concrete and approachable way :

एवमेव हृदिः साक्षात्प्रासादत्वेन संस्थितः ॥ (*Agni-p.*, 61. 26 cd).

Scriptures. The *prāṇa-pratiṣṭhā* marks the *mūrti* with a particular seal which elevates the *mūrti* above all other things and makes it an important point of contact between man and God.

This article has been revised, enlarged and translated by the Author from the original Italian which has been published as n. X of "Pubblicazioni di Indologica Taurinensis" directed by O. Botto, Torino, 1978.

THE ROLE OF FOUR VARṆAS DURING THE TIME OF NĪLĀDRI-MAHODAYAM

By

VIDYUT LATA RAY

The *Sihala-Purāṇa* Nīlādri-Mahodayam is a big work covering 91 *Adhyāyas*. This *Purāṇa* was compiled on the model of the *Puruṣottama-Māhātmya* of the *Skanda-purāṇa*. The internal and external evidence indicate that this *purāṇa* was composed sometime in the latter part of the 14th century A. D. This *Purāṇa*, though primarily a *Purāṇa* of Jagannātha *tattva* and Jagannātha cult, presents a fairly comprehensive picture of the society of its time. There is no doubt that the institution of Jagannātha influences the social life of the people of Orissa. A deep and careful study of the Nīlādri-Mahodayam opens out many striking features of the then society, in its social, political, economic and cultural aspects. A society, being dynamic in nature, is a mirror-image of civilization. The contemporary civilization is clearly reflected in the Nīlādri-Mahodayam with sufficient references to the duties of the *varṇas*.

The society figuring in the Nīlādri-Mahodayam mainly comprised two categories of people—the kings and the subjects. Both the classes were helpful to each other. The people were generally pious and courteous. They were dutiful and obedient. The life in the society was diversified with such activities as “*Śrauta, Smārta, Prayasaitta* and *Tīrtha*”. In his relation to the rest of society, each individual laid stress upon his duties, his *dharma*. The society was practically based on realistic idealism. The people, however, had various skills and accordingly they were known as administrators, agriculturists, physicians, blacksmiths, goldsmiths, carpenters, musicians, dancers, musicians, educationists, fore-tellers, magicians, etc. There also flourished some people having bad qualities. One kind of such people and calls the ‘*candā*’ (Candāla) formed the lowest stratum of the society.

10.115a : “*Cāṇḍālādi-jalaspr̥ṣtam.....*”

Varṇa

In the early Ṛg-vedic period, the *Āryas* and the *Anāryas*, *Dāsas* or *Dasyus* were the two distinct classes in the society. They were sharply distinguished from each other by their language, religion and several other aspects. There were ethnical and physiognomical differences; the *Dasyus* were dark-skinned whereas the *Āryas* were fair. Thus, the concept of *varṇa* originated in the very remote period of *Veda*. Due to the complexity of life, various classes were gradually springing up in the *Āryan* society. The *Avesta* shows that in the Indo-Iranian period, the *Āryan* society was divided into four classes—priests, warriors, farmers and artisans.² But the Indo-*Āryans* were divided into three classes among themselves—*Brāhmaṇa*, *Rājanya* and *Viś* in the earlier age; and *Brāhmaṇa*, *Kṣatriya* and *Vaiśya* in later times. The *Anāryas*, who were by this time almost completely subjugated, were also included in the *Varṇa*-scheme and formed the fourth class, the *Śūdra*.³ The names of the four *varṇas*, *Brāhmaṇa*, *Kṣatriya*, *Vaiśya* and *Śūdra* are expressly mentioned with their special characteristics in the famous Ṛg-vedic *Puruṣa-Sūkta*.⁴ In the age of the later *Saṃhitās*, *Brāhmaṇas*, *Upaniṣads* and *Purāṇas*, the classes continued to be fluid. The four-fold division of the society into the *Brāhmaṇas*, *Kṣatriyas*, *Vaiśyas* and the *Śūdras* has become fully established by the time of the *Nīlādri-Mahodayam*,⁵ though the principle in determining a *varṇa* became different from that of the Vedic period. Originally, these *varṇas* were formulated on the basis of *karma* (action) and not by *janma* (birth). But the principle of heredity received greater and greater recognition in the age of the later *Saṃhitās*, *Brāhmaṇas*, *Upaniṣads* and *Purāṇas*. Our *Purāṇa*⁶ mentions heredity as the main principle in determining the *varṇa* of an

2. *The Cultural Heritage of India*, Vol. I, p. 224.

3. P. V. Kane, *History of Dharma-Śāstra*, Vol. II, Part I, pp. 25-36.

4. *Ṛg-veda*, X. 90.12.

5. N. M. 11.79-80a :

*Deve kṣatriya-saṃspṛṣṭe mahāsnānadayanaṃ bhavet,
Vaiśyairvāratrayaṃ śūdraiḥcatuṣṭrayaṃ tadācarat.
Pūjāyām jalapātram vai Brāhmaṇaṃ ca viṇa nṛpa.*

6. N. M. 9.62 : *Māsadayādhiḥ sapta-varṇa-jāta uppatimā.
tadopanayanam kuryājjaṣṭhaputrasya dhīmata
9.73 : Tasya gotre yadā putre jṣṭhe na sṛṣṭe deṇṇatā.
dviṭṭyatanayam kuryād agnīrmanāpa-mādarat.*

individual. The rights and privileges of the different *varṇas* in the society had by that time been distinctly laid down and the people of a particular *varṇa* followed the *sva-dharma* as their duty.

Among the four *varṇas*, the *Brāhmaṇas*, the *Kṣatriyas*, the *Vaiśyas* and the *Śūdras*, the gradation of each preceding one was considered higher than that of the one following. Except the *Brāhmaṇas*, the *Nilādri-Mahodayam* forbids the other three *varṇas* from touching the deity or its *Naivedya* and prescribes '*Mahāsnānas*' of the deity if touched by *Kṣatriya*, *Vaiśya* and *Śūdra*.⁷ The *Purāṇa* prescribes twice, thrice and four-times '*Mahāsnānas*' for *Kṣatriya*, *Vaiśya* and *Śūdra*-touch respectively.⁸ Thus, the *Brāhmaṇas* were considered worthy of the highest respect in society and the *Śūdras* were the people of the lowest class. It is a remarkable fact worth noting here that the *Nilādri-Mahodayam* finds no difference among the animals, the birds and the people of the society while taking *Mahāprasāda* (*Bhoga*) of Lord Jagannātha.⁹ This process promotes brotherliness in the people without considerations of their caste and creed.

Varṇa-saṁkara :

The term *varṇa-saṁkara* means the various mixed-castes that emerged in the society due to the '*Anuloma*' and '*Pratiloma*' kinds of marriage.¹⁰ To the best of our knowledge, there is no occurrence of *varṇa-saṁkara* in the Vedic literature, though many instances of inter-caste marriage¹¹ can be cited from it. This is because *varṇa* was determined by the duty discharged by an individual. In the *Dharmaśāstra* works, there is frequent occurrence of the term '*varṇa-saṁkara*' in connection with castes and sub-castes.¹² *Manu*¹³

7. N. M. 11.78 :

*Kṣatriyaśca yadā vaiśyaḥ śūdraśca daivataḥ spṛšet.
tadācarenmahāsnānaṁ dvigunaṁ kramaśo hareḥ.*

8. N.M. 11/79 : *Deve kṣatriyasaṁspṛṣṭe mahāsnānavayā bhavet,
Vaiśyairvāratrayaṁ śūdraiścaturvāraṁ tadācayet.*

9. N. M. 11.115 : *Cāṇḍālādi-jalasprṣṭaṁ tadannaṁ ca nṛpottama,
Bhoṭkavyaṁ sahasā vipraiḥ pāvanaṁ suradurlabhaṁ.*

10. *Sūtra-Nīti*, p. 223, *Manu*, 1.2; S. D. Gyani, *Agni-purāṇa—A study*, p. 240.

11. P. V. Kane, *History of Dharma-Śāstra*, Vol. II, p. 447.

12. D. R. Patil, *Cultural History from the Vāyu Purāṇa*, p. 123 and fn 23.

13. *Manu*, X. 1 ff.

illustrates the various *saṁkara-jātis* that originated in the 'anuloma' kind of marriage. The *Dharmaśāstras* generally relate the term '*varṇa-saṁkara*' to the promotion of social relations among the four *varṇas*. However, the Nīlādri-Mahodayam does not refer directly to the idea of *varṇa-saṁkara* but includes the Mlecchas¹⁴ along with the other people of the society. In some works, the Mlecchas are also considered as products of *varṇa-saṁkara*.¹⁵

The Brāhmaṇas and their role :

The *Brāhmaṇas* in the Nīlādri-Mahodayam stood at the head of the *varṇa* scheme. Being the first class in the society, they were to conserve the ancient ideals, to maintain and develop the ancient rituals, to probe the mysteries of the universe, to investigate the relation between the Supreme spirit and the individual Soul and above all to preach the realization of the truths. The Bhagavad-Gītā characterizes the conduct of a *Brāhmaṇa* by tranquility, self-restraint, penance, purity, forgiveness, straightforwardness, knowledge, wisdom, realization of truth, and faith¹⁶—in fact, the *Brāhmaṇas* dedicated themselves to everything that was good and righteous. The study of the *Veda* was their primary concern. While introducing a *Brāhmaṇa*¹⁷ in general, the Nīlādri-Mahodayam speaks of him as "proficient in the *Veda* and its auxiliaries, in the *Smṛtis*, *Āgamas*, *Pāñcarātras* and the *Purāṇas*."¹⁸ The zealous devotion with which the *Brāhmaṇas* applied themselves to the study of the *Veda* qualify them alone to undertake and discharge with efficiency the duty of a priest. Learning the *Vedas*, officiating at sacrifices, receiving the gifts and advising the king in various matters were the main duties of the *Brāhmaṇas* during the time of the Nīlādri-Mahodayam.

The *Brāhmaṇa* as an officiating priest at sacrifices figures from the Rg veda onwards. The instances of the performances of sacri-

14. N. M. 37.135a : "Mlecchaśca yatra....."
15. D. R. Patil, *Cultural History from the Vāyu Purāṇa*, p. 124 and *Vāyu-Purāṇa*, 49.55.
16. *Bhagavad-Gītā*, XVIII, 42.
17. N. M. 9.3 : *Śṛṇu rājan mahāprājña jagadīśaśya māpatāḥ. Ācāryapramukhānāṁ ca lakṣaṇāṁ kathayāmyakam.*
18. N. M. 9.4-5a : *Sarvesāṁ sevakānāṁ ca śreṣṭhāḥ sa pūjako mataḥ*

*Vedavedāṅgavicchuddhāḥ pañcarātraviśāradāḥ
Smṛtyāgamapurāṇajñāḥ śāntaśca satkulodbhavaḥ.
Vaidikāṁstāntrikān mantrān jānmācārārapāṇ ghr̥ṇī*

fices by the *Brāhmaṇas* are abundant in our *Purāṇa*. The *Purāṇa* has provided for us a state of facts about *yajña*. The great *Aśva-medha*-sacrifice arranged by the king *Indradyumna* was successfully performed by the *Brāhmaṇas*. The king being pleased with them offered immense gifts, which included clothes, gold, rice, precious ornaments and also cows.¹⁹ The *Brāhmaṇas* were considered the worthiest recipients of *dānas* and *dakṣiṇās*. The acceptance of gifts remained their principal means of livelihood. Rich and profuse gifts were granted to them by the kings on various occasions such as sacrifices, coronations, installations of temples, deities and *Rathas*. King *Indradyumna* gave a lot of *dānas* to the *Brāhmaṇas* and fed them well after the installation of the *Rathas* of Lord *Jagannātha*, *Bālabhadra* and *Subhadra*.²⁰ In some cases, land was also one among the gifts offered to the *Brāhmaṇas*.²¹ Satisfying the *Brāhmaṇas* with *dakṣiṇās* was one of the sacred duties of the people.²² Our *Purāṇa* also frequently refers to half or a part of *dakṣiṇā* in want of its full amount. It is necessary to add here that in return for their services the *Brāhmaṇas* did not expect much. But the *pūjā* goes in vain without some kind of *dakṣiṇā*.²³ The topic of *dāna*, however, finds a very elaborate treatment in the *Nīlādri-Mahodayam* which contains principles and regulations regarding the proper *dāna*, its kinds and religious efficacies.

In the *Nīlādri-Mahodayam*, the *Brāhmaṇas* are seen invariably present in all social and religious functions. The kings and princes cherished their friendship and took pride in doing them service. Perhaps in every kingdom there was a *Brāhmaṇa purohita*, who was

19. N. M. 3.94-96 : *Yajñānte vahudānāni tena dattāni koṭīṣaḥ Annaiśca.....*"

20. N. M. 5.65-66 :
*Suvarṇaṁ rajataṁ ratnaṁ vastraṁ dhānyaṁ ca gāṁ punaḥ
datvā santōṣayedvipraṁ karma kartāra muttamam
bhojayet brāhmaṇān divyaṁ pāyasam madhusarpiṣā
annaṁ pūpādikāṁ tāvat pratiṣṭhānte tato divjāḥ*

21. N. M. 16.131 :
*Pūrṇāhutiṁ tataḥ kṛtvā hema-bhūmyādi dakṣiṇām
datvā vahuvidhāṁ divai ratnair vipraṁśca toṣayet*

22. N. M. 13.37b :
"Suvarṇaiśca tadācāryaṁ toṣayed dakṣiṇārpanāt"

23. N. M. 23.336 :
"Dakṣiṇāyā abhāvena tatsarvaṁ niṣphalaṁ bhavet"

also the king's chief counsellor.²⁴ The *purohita* figures in our *Purāṇa* as an important person in matters of state, as an adviser whose advice was heeded with respect and as one who could represent the king in his absence.²⁵ The *purohita* of Indradyumna wielded considerable influence in matters of state. He advised the king to send his (*purohita*'s) younger brother, Vidyāpati, to locate the god Nīlamādhava in Oḍra-deśa and the king did accordingly.²⁶ Thus, he was the co-adjutor and the alter ego of the king.

The *Brāhmaṇas* commanded very high respect in society. They were universally regarded as *Bhūśura*,²⁷ *Mahīśura*²⁸ or *Dharaṇīśura*²⁹ (divinities on the earth). The superiority of a *Brāhmaṇa* is recognized from the time of the Ṛg-veda onwards. According to our *Purāṇa*, God becomes satisfied with the satisfaction of the *Brāhmaṇa*.³⁰ The Śatapatha-*Brāhmaṇa* states that "oblations go to the gods and the fee to the learned *Brāhmaṇas* who are the human gods."³¹ Some of the *Dharmaśāstras* assign to them a status superior to that of the gods. According to Manu, a *Brāhmaṇa*, learned or not, is a deity.³² Similar expressions also occur in the Mahābhārata.³³ But, such a theoretical claim that a *Brāhmaṇa* is superior even to gods is not found in the Nīlādri-Mahodayam. This *Purāṇa* affirms that a *Brāhmaṇa* is just like Viṣṇu himself.³⁴

24. N. M. 2.42-43.

25. N. M. 9.66 : ".....So'yaṁ pratinidhi stava
utsaveṣu ca sarveṣu....."

26. N. M. 2.44-48.

27. N. M. 2.97 : "Mitratām tena vai sārddham saṁpādya sa ca
bhīśura"
42.44a : "Vatūṁ dhārayate yastu vinā mantrāṇa Bhīśuraḥ."

28. N. M. 2.96C :
"Tamāṅgitavān gadhaṁ viṣṇuvuddhya mahīśuraḥ"

29. N. M. 2.96b : "Iti viśvanasoroḍḍhikā tritoḥ sa dharaṇīśuraḥ,"
22.10a : "Brahmāṇam toṣamaham tōṣad vṛṣe sa dharaṇīśuraḥ"

30. N. M. 9/24 : Ācāryasya ca santato santato jagadāṁ pātā
tasthimstuṣṭe haristustho jagadetaccarāṇam.

31. Macdonell and Keith, *Vedic Index*, I.396 cf. also Kane, 2.837 ff.

32. Kane, 2.135.

33. Ibid, 136.

34. N.M. 2.52b :

"Sākṣādvīṣṇusvarūpasto'haṁ brāhmaṇaḥ sa nīlādri"

This *Purāṇa* refers to the various divisions prevailing among the *Brāhmaṇas*. The words, *dvija*³⁵ and *vipra*³⁶ are of very frequent occurrence. Besides, we find the categories, *Ācārya*, *caruhotā*, *pātrahotā*, *Brahmā* and *Agnīarmā* included in the hierarchy of the *Brāhmaṇas*.³⁷ The *Nīlādri-Mahodayam*, in its chapter nine (*navama adhyāya*), vividly explains the *lakṣaṇas* of *ācārya* and *Agnīarmā*. The following *lakṣaṇas* were attributed to an *ācārya Brāhmaṇa*. He should not be a limbless person, a widower, or a diseased man. He should be polite and should have 'vratus' of a 'Tapasvī'. He should have no sexual anxieties and his conduct should always be based upon good manners.³⁸ An *Agnīarmā Brāhmaṇa* had the following qualities. "He should observe *brahmacārya* and should study *Vedas*. He should not take his meal in the house of others. He should not talk with women and *sūdras*. He should have *upanayana-saṁskāra*. He should be polite and his manners should be always good."³⁹ In all festivals and sacrifices, the *Agnīarmā* represented the king.⁴⁰ The *pūjaka Brāhmaṇas* used 'tilaka' on the forehead and on their chests. Our *Purāṇa* mentions special shapes for the *tilaka* on the forehead and on the chest. The *tilaka* on the forehead was stick-shaped, that on the chest had the shape of a lotus-leaf.⁴¹

Brahma-hatyā (killing a *Brāhmaṇa*) was one of the most grievous sins. According to *Nīlādri-Mahodayam*, one can be free from such sins only if one visits 'Kalpa-pādapa', 'Kapālamocana' and takes 'Nirmālya' of Lord Jagannātha.⁴² Prostrating length-wise in the shade of *Ratha* frees one from all the sins, including *Brahma-hatyā*.⁴³

35. N. M. 2.112a; 5.33b; 5.66b; 5.54.

36. N. M. 16.131b; 2.90a; 2.101b; 4.21a; 5.65b.

37. N. M. 7.112a; 9.61a.

38. N. M. 9.6-7 : *Āṅgahīnaḥ patnīhīno na bhaved rogasamṃyutaḥ. Vinayena yutaḥ śrīmān tapasvī sa ca suvrataḥ. Kāmādi-doṣarahitaḥ sadācārapratīṣṭhitaḥ. ācāryastādṛśaḥ śrīmān bhavettasya pārātmanah.*

39. N. M. 9.62-65.

40. N. M. 9.66 : *Vastrācchāditaśrīṣaśca so'yaṁ pratinidhi stava Utsaheṣu ca sarveṣu śirapaṇiṁ sureśvaram.*

41. N. M. 38.46-47a.

42. N. M. 1.31a : "Brahmahatyādi-pāpāghno varittate kalpa-pādapaḥ"
N. M. 1.38b : *Paśyatām jagatām vāpi brahmahatyādi-pāpāhā.*"
N. M. 10.113a : "Brahmahatyādi-pāpāghnaṁ nirmālyaṁ jagatām pateḥ"

43. N. M. 16.119 : *Rathacchāyām samālambya bhaktiśraddhānvitā yadā, Brahmahatyādi-pāpābhyaḥ muktāḥ syur bhavabandhanāt.*"

The Kṣatriyas and their role

In some verses of the Ṛg-veda, the word *Kṣatriya* means 'a king or a noble-man'. The word *rājanya* is found in the Ṛg-Veda only once in the *Puruṣa-sūkta*, but in the later Vedic literature it is often used for a man of the royal family.⁴⁴ During the time of Nīlādri-Mahodayam, the *Kṣatriyas* were the martial section of the community. The status of a *Kṣatriya* in society was next to that of a *Brāhmaṇa*. Indradyumna, though a king, paid respect to the *Brāhmaṇa* Vidyāpati.⁴⁵ As rulers, the *Kṣatriyas* were sometimes commanding over the *Brāhmaṇas*—the king Indradyumna allowed the *Brāhmaṇa* Vidyāpati to go to *Oḍradeśa* in search of the deity 'Nīlamādhava'.⁴⁶ Our *Purāṇa* hints at the *Sūryavamśa* origin of the *Kṣatriyas* by mentioning that the king Indradyumna was born in *Sūryavamśa*.⁴⁷ The *Kṣatriyas* were mainly instructed in the art of war and in state politics.

The *Kṣatriya-Brāhmaṇa* relationship was very close. The *Kṣatriyas* handled the administrative powers of the state whereas the *Brāhmaṇas* were the chief counsellors to them. Only *Kṣatriyas* were considered competent to become rulers and in that capacity they had to ensure a free and due observance of *dharma* by everyone in society. Arrangement of sacrifices was the duty of *Kṣatriyas*, mainly of *Kṣatriya-kings*. The performance of sacrifices, on the one hand, brought merit to the arranger and, on the other hand, it offered subsistence to the *Brāhmaṇas* who depended mainly on the charities given to them by the other *varṇas*. Thus, the *Kṣatriyas* and the *Brāhmaṇas* were intimately related to each other.

The duties of the Vaiśyas

In the Nīlādri-Mahodayam, the *vaiśyas* are often mentioned just to complete the list of the *varṇas*. From the information scattered loosely in the *Purāṇa*, it appears that the *vaiśyas* were a community engaged in trade and commerce. The *vaiśyas* focussed

44. D. R. Patil, *Cultural History from the Vāyu Purāṇa*, p. 139.

45. N. M. 2.112 : *Āyātām taṁ dvijaśreṣṭhām Indradyumno mahī-patiḥ*

Āsanāt sahasoṭthāya namaskṛtya ca taṁ punaḥ.

46. N. M. 2.47b

"*Gaccha gaccha dvijaśreṣṭha talloḥṣyaṁ kuru vegataḥ*"

47. N.M. 2.8b : "*Jataḥ kṛtavyuge viprah sūryavamśasamudbhavaḥ*"

their attention mainly on wealth and profit. They formed the basis upon which the other two classes of society, the *Brāhmaṇa* and the *Kṣatriya*, rested.

The duties of the Śūdras

The Nilādri-Mahodayam describes the *śūdras* as a *varṇa* of the lowest rank in society. Their principal duty was to serve the higher three *varṇas*. The *śūdras* were considered as the degraded ones. They were forbidden to touch the materials ready for the worship of Lord Jagannātha.⁴⁸ They were not allowed to enter the kitchen of Lord Jagannātha.⁴⁹ Such references as the *śūdras* studying the *Vedas*, worshiping the deities and performing the sacrifices are not included in our *Purāṇa*. In the *Dharmasāstras* we find many disabilities imposed on *śūdras* and the Mahābhārata says that they cannot own property.⁵⁰ According to our *Purāṇa*, their presence at the sacrificial altar was considered contaminating.

The Śabaras and their activities

In addition to the *varṇas* discussed above, the Nilādri-Mahodayam mentions the *Śabaras* and the *Yavanas* as the other races of the society. There were *Śabara*-dwellings situated to the west of the Puruṣottama Kṣetra.⁵¹ The text of our *Purāṇa* reveals that the *Śabaras* lived in the forests. They were hospitable to their guests. They lived on fruits and roots collected from the forest. The Nilādri-Mahodayam describes that the *Brāhmaṇa* Vidyāpati, while searching for the deity Nilamādhava, met with the great *Śabara* Viśvāvasu in the forest of *Śabara-dvīpa*. Viśvāvasu paid respect to Vidyāpati and warmly welcomed him with fruits and roots.⁵² The deity Nilamādhava was worshiped by the *Śabara* Viśvāvasu in a cave in the forest.⁵³ This evidence shows that,

48. N. M. 42.41a : “Śūdrādīnāṃ spṛśyamānaḥ.....”

49. N. M. 7.50b ; “Na viśeyur yathā śūdrā.....”

50. D. R. Patil, *Cultural History from the Vāyu Purāṇa*, p. 150.

51. N. M. 1.63b : “Kṣetrasya pascime deśe varṭtate śabarālayaḥ

52. N. M. 2.50b-51 : Śanaiḥ Śanairviveśātha śabaradvīpakānane
tam dṛṣṭvā śabaraśreṣṭho viśvāvasu ranuttamah.
namaskṛtyārc ayedvīpraṃ phalamūlādibhir dvījā.h

53. N. M. 2.53a : “.....vanametacca gahvaram”

2.71b-c Vidyāpate nīlatanum mādHAVam devadurlabham
drakṣisyasi param devam.....

the *Śabaras* were the real *Vaiṣṇavas*. They were not untouchables though they lived far away from the towns and villages. They worshiped their own deity with all sincerity and devotion but worshipping the gods or goddesses was not their profession. They did not hold any office in the king's court. They led their independent lives amidst the wild animals in the dense and fearsome forests.⁵⁴

The Yavanas in the society

The *Yavanas* were a sect of people living in the contemporary society. They were not allowed to enter temples or to be present at the sacrificial altar. Even talks relating to them near *Naivedya* were considered contaminating.⁵⁵ Our *Purāṇa* describes in detail the mishappenings to be occurred to the deity, to the king and to the country by the entrance of a *Yavana* into the temple of Lord Jagannātha.⁵⁶ The author of the *Nīlādri-Mahodaya* warns the king to be alert about this and prescribes *Mahāsnāna* of the deity if at any time a *Yavana* enters a temple.

Ascetics and their role

The *Nīlādri-Mahodayam* in its first *adhyāya* mentions the sages of the *Naimiṣa* forest.⁵⁷ The sages had their disciples. They had the knowledge of all the *tīrthas* of the world.⁵⁸ The kings and their people paid respect to the ascetics. The sages on their part were the guardians and promoters of culture and as such they were deeply interested in the pace and progress of the state. The rules of conduct and the ideals of morality of the *Ṛṣis* inspired the king and the clown alike in their behaviour. It is noteworthy that they always considered the visit of a sage to the royal court a matter of great pleasure and honour for himself. The *Ṛṣi* *Jaṭila*

54. N. M. 2.61a-b : ".....*mārgo* *sti bhayaśamkulaḥ*
Siṃhavyāghrādibhirnūnaṃ devānāmapyagocaraḥ.

55. N.M. 7.108b-109a : "*Yavanīyakathā jāta naivedyanikaḥ tadā,*
tannaivedyam vahiṣkṛtya dīrghakṣhāte nipātayet

56. N. M. 13.36 : *Prākāradehalīm nīco yavāno yadi laṅghayet*
tadābhaven' mahādoṣaḥ kṣīṇāyur nṛpatir bhavet
cittabhramo pi nṛpater deśabhaṅgo bhavettadā

57. N. M. 1.36 : "*Tādṛṣe* *pi vana ramye Śaunakādya munīnoraḥ*

58. N. M. 1.46 : "*Samastatīrtha tattoṇām jñānayo jagatītaḥ*"

narrated the story of Mādhava to king Indradyumna,⁵⁹ who then made arrangements for a journey to *Puruṣottama-kṣetra*.⁶⁰ The sages had the knowledge of different yogas. Indradyumna asked the *Maharṣi* Nārada to know about the *jñāna-yoga*, *vairāgya yoga* and *bhakti-yoga*⁶¹ etc. Our *Purāṇa* mentions that the *Rṣis* asked Sūta to narrate the *tīrtha-tattva* for the benefit of all.⁶²

Thus the four *varṇas* helped one another to survive in the society. They were devotees of their respective duties which they rendered with all sincerity. The scheme of works, which they have taken up in the Jagannātha temple, finds an elaborate description in the Nīlādri-Mahodayam. According to the same rule, they are now also discharging their duties in the temple. To whichever *varṇa* they may belong, they perform today their own duties in the temple in accordance with their hereditary customs.

59 N. M. 2.20-25; 2.28-36.

60 N. M. 2.39 ;

“Tataḥ purodhasaṁ prāha tannimittam sa satvarah.”

61. N. M. 2.128 : Jñānavairāgyayoryogaṁ bhaktiyogasaya kāraṇam
caturvidhasaṁ yogam prṣṭavānavanīśvaram.

62. N. M. 1.9b ; “Ūcuḥ prāṇjalyaḥ sarve sarvalokahitāya vaḥ”

THE SYAMANTAKA GEM STORY : A STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS

By

IVAN STRFENSKI

Since no previous work, to our knowledge, has been done on the Syamantaka Gem story other than the passing comments of purāṇic scholars such as H. H. Wilson,¹ F. E. Pargiter,² K. P. Jayaswal³ and D. R. Patil,⁴ we thought that a fresh approach to the story might bring rewards of its own, but also, perhaps, give us some hints as to why our story has caused these scholars to pause over it.

Before we do so, we would like to fill in some necessary background notes on the Purāṇas and on those Purāṇas with which we will be associated most closely—the *Vāyu*, *Matsya* and especially the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*. The Purāṇas—literally meaning “ancient lore”, or “that which come from ancient times”,⁵ constitute a class of Indian religious literature (Smṛti) which is divided into two main sub-classes : the Mahāpurāṇas, of which there number 18 and the Upapurāṇas, of which over 100 are counted. This division separates roughly the recognized, authentic or chief purāṇas from minor works which associate themselves to the primary 18. Lists of the 18 as found in all 18 Mahāpurāṇas (which we shall now refer to simply as Purāṇas) are in almost complete agreement with one another on the make up of this list.⁶ The popular religious

-
1. Wilson, H. H., *Essays Analitical and Critical*, Trubner, London, 1864, p. 133.
 2. Pargiter, F. E., *Ancient Indian Historical Tradition*, Oxford University Press, London, 1922.
 3. Jayaswal, K. P., *Hindu Polity*, Butterworth, London, 1924 Vol. 1. p. 42.
 4. Patil, D. R., *Cultural History from the Vāyu Purāṇa*, Deccan College, Poona, 1946, pp. 24, 101, 120, 172f, 318.
 5. Pusalker, A. D., *Studies In the Epics and Purāṇas*, Bharati-Vidya Bhavan, Bombay, 1963, pp. 22.
 6. Winternitz, M., *A History of Indian Literature*. Calcutta University Press, Calcutta, 1933, I, pp. 531ff.

significance of the Purāṇas to Hinduism is (and has been) considerable—despite the censure of the Hindu reformers¹ and the continued disapproval of them among Hindu intellectuals like Dr. S. Radhakrishnan. I quote :

The Purāṇas with their wild chronology and wierd stories are mainly imaginative literature, but were treated as a part of the sacred tradition for the simple reason that some people took interest in them.²

There is much irremedial confusion as to the contents and chronology of the Purāṇas since they form a literature not only partly oral and popular in origin but one which has suffered considerable emendations at the hands of successive generations of compilers and redactors. We may however settle on some very rough dates of origin (or codification) and agree upon a common general set of contents. Thus, the *Vāyu* and *Matsya Purāṇas* have a recognized antiquity and may be dated as not earlier than 400 BC nor later than 500 AD.³ The *Viṣṇu*, according to recent estimates, spans the period between 100 AD and 350 AD⁴, while the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* must not be dated earlier than 500 AD nor later than 950 AD.⁵ Contentwise, the Purāṇas are closely connected with the Epics. Winternitz states that the *Mahābhārata* and the *Hariṣamśa* are “nothing other than Purāṇas and sections of the *Rāmāyaṇa* partake of the character of Purāṇas”.⁶ They are like “new wine in old bottles”⁷ says Winternitz and often draw independently from similar sources, such as the Epics. The Purāṇas however agree among themselves that the “characteristics” requisite of the “genuine” Purāṇa are five. Known as the five “Pañcalakṣaṇa”,

-
1. Walker, B., *Hindu World*. George Allen and Unwin, London, 1968, 1, p. 270.
 2. Radhakrishnan, S., *The Hindu View of Life*, Unwin Books, London, 1965, p. 17.
 3. Patil, D. R., p. 4.
 4. Hazra, R. C., “The Date of the Viṣṇu Purāṇa”, *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute*, XVIII, p. 269.
 5. Hopkins, T. J., “The Social Teaching of the Bhāgavata Purāṇa” in M. Singer (ed) *Krishna Myth. Rites and Attitudes*, East-West Center Press, Honolulu, 1900, p. 4.
 - 6,7. Winternitz, M., pp. 517f, 518.

these marks refer to kinds of accounts each Purāṇa must relate. They are :

- (1) primary creation,
- (2) secondary periodic re-creations and periodic cosmic dissolutions,
- (3) genealogies of the gods, ṛṣis and heroes,
- (4) activities of the Ages of Manu,
- (5) history of the solar and lunar dynasties¹.

With Pargiter's work on the dynastic lists of the Purāṇas² and the more recent work of Patil on Indian cultural history from the *Vāyu*³ some case has been made for the historical value of the Purāṇas, though considerable caution and discrimination must be exercised in any claims for the historicity of any puranic reference.⁴ The Purāṇas are especially valuable to the historian of religion because they provide sources and accounts of myths, rituals, religious beliefs, ethical prohibitions and social conditions—whether or not these are real or imagined. Ancient theories of Indian geography, cosmography and cosmology have been reconstructed from the Purāṇas along with the cultural and political systems mentioned earlier.⁵

The *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* is evidently a product of the Vaiṣṇavas and though it concentrates on the exaltation and glorification of Viṣṇu, there is some debate as to the propriety of Wilson's calling it sectarian.⁶ Viṣṇu's primacy is a more positive thing : Śiva and Brahmā are mentioned in the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa*, but assimilated to Viṣṇu.⁷ The great antiquity of the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* is suggested because of the absence of references to special feasts, temples, sacri-

1. *Ibid.*, p. 522.

2. Pargiter, F. E., *Ancient Indian. Historical Tradition*.

3. Patil, D. R., *Cultural History from the Vayu Purāṇa*.

4. Winternitz, M., p. 529.

5. Ali, S. M., *The Geography of the Puranas*, People's Publishing House, New Delhi, 1966.

6. Wilson, H. H., "Preface" to *The Vishnu Purana*; Pusalker; Roy, S. N., "The Date of the Viṣṇu-Purāṇa's Chapters on Māyāmoha Legend", *Purāṇa*, VII, 1965, pp. 276-287.

7. *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* : Brahma, pp. 2, 18, 396; Śiva, p. 18.

fices, rituals dedicated to Viṣṇu. Perhaps more so than any other Purāṇa, it bears the five characteristics of a genuine Purāṇa. Though the dating of any purāṇa is a risky matter, R. C. Hazra has recently suggested that it could not have been later than 500 AD.¹

After the accounts of creation and the nature of the universe and mythological narratives of past kings and sages of Book I, cosmography and geography of Book II and the account of the Manu ages of book III, the Syamantaka Gem story in the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* is found among the genealogical lists of the solar and lunar dynasties in Book IV. Book V is Practically identical to the *Harivaṁśa* and recounts the much beloved adventures of Kṛṣṇa as divine cow-herd. The *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* ends characteristically with an account of the world end and with a brief recapitulation of previous ages and the contents of the Purāṇa.

The second source of the Syamantaka Gem story with which we shall chiefly compare the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* version is taken from the famous *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*. One of the most recent purāṇic compositions, which according to T. J. Hopkins² may be said to have existed not earlier than 500 A. D. and not later than 950 A.D., the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* seems to be the work of a consistent viewpoint concerned with the propagation of loving devotion (*bhakti*) to Viṣṇu—especially in his incarnation as Kṛṣṇa. The close resemblance in content between the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* and the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* suggests that the latter served as its model. Significantly, it sometimes serves as its anti-model—since the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* seems to react against various pro-Vedic tendencies in the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* (as we will argue in our following analysis). Unlike the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* (most probably) it is more clearly the product of a sect presenting a divine Kṛṣṇa whose amorous adventures with the Gopīs occupy even more space than in the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa*. It damns Vedic religion “with faint praise when it is not openly

-
1. Hazra, R. C., pp. 265-275; Winternitz, M., p. 545; Pargiter, F. E., p. 80.
 2. Hopkins, T. J., p. 4; Renou, L., *Religions of Ancient India*, London University Press, London, 1953, p. 103; Winternitz, M., p. 556.

criticized"¹ and criticizes the *Mahābhārata* and other Purāṇas for a lack of sufficient zeal for Viṣṇu. "*Bhakti*" as an independent means of salvation is proclaimed.²

The *Matsya purāṇa*—one of those purāṇas which have preserved the most ancient text, only contains a fragment of the Syamantaka Gem story. This purāṇa celebrates the incarnation of Viṣṇu as a fish who saves Manu alone during the great flood which destroys mankind at one of the world-dissolutions. It recounts the creation, genealogies, geographical, astronomical and cosmological matters and lists the dynasties of kings. Both Viṣṇu and Śiva legends are related in the *Matsya purāṇa*.

Ancient text is preserved by the *Vāyu*, which is often considered the oldest of purāṇas. Śiva seems the main object of veneration in the *Vāyu* although Viṣṇu is also honoured. It has been used as a source of cultural history by D. R. Patil who has distinguished three periods reflected in the compilation of the *Vāyu* ranging from the archaic (500 BC and earlier) to the ancient (500 BC to 0) to the age of accretions (0-500 AD).³ The Syamantaka Gem story agrees broadly with the *Viṣṇu purāṇa* version though significant differences are to be noticed in which the *Vāyu* tends to agree with the *Mahābhārata* tradition against the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa*.⁴ Since the *Vāyu* is not available in English translation, we have had to rely on citations and reference from Patil's study which, all the same, have proved interesting.

The method of story-analysis which follows is chiefly a loose adaptation of the insights of Claude Levi-Strauss which first appeared in his "Structural Study of Myth" (1955), "The Myth of Asdiwal" (1967 of French 1958) and finally in a full way in his *Mythologiques : le Cru et le cuit* (1964), *Du Miel aux cendres* (1966) and *L'Origine des manieres de table* (1968). Our analysis also draws from I. Moore's attempts to do a task similar to Levi-Strauss's, but in an even more rigorous way by the construction of a syntax and semantics of stories. The groundwork for Moore's science of

1. Hopkins, T. J., p. 12.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 13.

3. Patil, D. R., p. 14.

4. *Ibid.*, p. 172.

stories and its relation to Levi-Strauss's work can be found in his *Levi-Strauss and the Cultural Sciences* (1968) and in a soon-to-be-published essay covering much the same ground as *Levi-Strauss and the Cultural Sciences*. We would also refer the reader to E. R. Leach's structural analyses of two stories from Genesis : "Levi-Strauss in the Garden of Eden" (1961) and "Genesis as Myth" (1962) as well as M. S. Robinson's attempt to derive some useful implications of a Sinhalese myth by structural means. "The House the Mighty Hero" or 'The House of Enough Paddy'? (1968). Although we believe our analysis achieves the rigor necessary for a useful demonstration of structural methods, it falls short of the high degree of formality Moore's semantic and syntactical approach calls for. Nonetheless we would hold that even on the level of rigor at which our analysis operates, useful implications can be drawn from our story sufficient to commend a structural approach to the analysis of stories.

A. Structural Analysis of the Syamantaka Gem Story.

Following Levi-Strauss's instructions, the structural analysis of a myth begins by isolating the gross constituent units of which a myth is composed. These constituent units themselves are composed of relations and are abstracted from the myth by "breaking down its story into the shortest possible sentences and writing each such sentence on an index card bearing a number corresponding to the unfolding of the story."¹

It may also be noticed that these "sentences" correspond roughly to "incidents" of the story. Now, "incidents" occur at a level of generality, one step below that of the "episode". Thus, most generally, a story is composed of "episodes", which are further composed of "incidents", which may be broken down further into "transformations", which in turn are composed of "states", which finally are composed of "elements". In our story the first episode might be called the 'episode of the giving of the gem'. In it we distinguish two incidents, the first of which is "Sūrya gives the Syamantaka Gem to Satrājī". This gives way to the "transformations" which we may abstract depending upon

1. Levi-Strauss, C, "The Structural Study of Myth", Ch. XI, *Structural Anthropology*, Allen Lane, London 1968. p. 211.

how far we want to push the rigor of the analysis. (1) Satrājīṭ without the gem; Satrājīṭ with the gem; (2) Sūrya has the gem; Sūrya has no gem. The "transformations" in turn reduce to a "layout" of "states" (1) Satrājīṭ with the gem; (2) Satrājīṭ without the gem. And the "state" is a "layout" of "elements".

(1) Satrājīṭ (2) with (3) Gem.¹

In our analysis of the Syamantaka Gem story, however, we will not attempt to articulate a structure beyond the level of the "incident"—although we will analyze the structure of several elements of our story in a digression. At the level of "incidents" we feel that an adequate case can be made for a certain structure which illuminate and ground certain themes of the myth. Though we carry out our analysis on the incident-level it should be understood that, along with Levi-Strauss, we believe that the true constituent units of a myth are not the individual incidents (relations) but "*bundles of such relations* and it is only as bundles that these relations can be put to use and combined so as produce a meaning".² Though these relations pertaining to the same "bundle" appear in the story at various intervals we grasp them in such a way that by reading horizontally from left to right (as in Table I) one follows the diachronic flow of the story as one would tell it. Reading vertically, however, one notice six columns which organize the variously occurring relations into "bundles" having a common element, whether it be "giving", as in column one, or "destroying" as in column five. (See Table I)

A List of Abbreviations.

A=Akrūra; D=Dvārakā; J=Jāmbavat; Ja=Jāmbavatī;
K=Kṛṣṇa; L=a Lion; P=Prasena; B=Balarāma; S=Satrājīṭ;
Sa=Satyabhāmā; Sh=Satadhanvan; SG=the Syamantaka Gem;
Su=Sūrya; Suk=Sukumāra; Ys=the Yādavas.

Legend : Numbers before the decimal refer to episode-numbers in Viṣṇu. Numbers after the decimal refer to incident-number in the Viṣṇu.

1. Moore, Tim, *Claude Levi-Strauss and the Cultural Sciences*. Occasional Papers, No. 4, Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, Birmingham University, Birmingham, 1968, for details of such an analysis.
2. Levi-Strauss, C., p. 211.

We hope to show that our adaptation of Levi-Strauss's method for the analysis of stories is fruitful for the understanding of our myth, in which case we should concentrate upon considering each column in Table I as a unity—as a “bundle” of similar relations. To understand the myth, then, on the premisses employed, is to understand how these bundles of relations stand with respect to one another, and how the relations between and among these bundles of relations illuminate the meanings our myth might have. This is to penetrate to a structural understanding of our myth in order to substantiate various claims regarding a myth's having a particular meaning.

Given this brief introduction we should now lay the Syamantaka Gem story before the reader as it occurs in the *Viṣṇu*, *Bhāgavata* and *Matsya* Purāṇas. Dowson's precis of what seems the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* version of the story is given with episode divisions corresponding to those we have provided for the full version of the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* of our story. The reader will notice that the story is broken down into episodes which are numbered as they occur in each separate Purāṇa. So that the reader may compare versions by episode, a code has been provided. After each episode number for each version of the story the reader will find three numbers within parenthesis. These numbers correspond to the numbers of the episode for all versions in the order *Viṣṇu*, *Bhāgavata*, *Matsya*. A dash (—) means that this episode is absent from the particular purāṇic version. Thus, after Episode 2 of the *Viṣṇu* the following figures within parenthesis will be found: (2, 2, 1), meaning that the second episode for the *Viṣṇu* and *Bhāgavata* purāṇas is the first for the *Matsya*.

Dowson's Precis of the Syamantaka Gem Story

‘(1) A celebrated gem given by the sun to Satrājīṭ. “It yielded daily eight loads of gold and dispelled all fear of portents, wild beasts, fire, robbers, and famine.” But though it was an inexhaustible source of good for the virtuous wearer, it was deadly to a wicked one. (2) Satrājīṭ being afraid that Kṛṣṇa would take it from him, gave it to his own brother, Prasena, but he, being a bad man, was killed by a lion. Jāmbavat, king of the bears, killed the lion and carried off the gem; (3) but Kṛṣṇa, after a long conflict, (4) took it

from him, (5) and restored it to Satrājī. (6, 7 omitted by Dowson) (8) Afterwards Satrājīta was killed in his sleep by Śata-dhanwan, (9) who carried off the gem. Being pursued by Kṛṣṇa and Bala-rāma, he gave the gem to Akrūra and continued his flight, but he was overtaken and killed by Kṛṣṇa alone. As Kṛṣṇa did not bring back the jewel, Bala-rāma suspected that he had secreted it, and consequently he upbraided and parted from him, declaring that he would not be imposed upon by perjuries. (10 omitted by Dowson), (11) Akrūra subsequently produced the gem, and it was claimed by Kṛṣṇa, Bala-rāma and Satyabhāmā. After some contention it was decided that Akrūra should keep it, and so "he moved about like the sun wearing a garland of light."¹

A List of Alternative Names

Kṛṣṇa : "Acyuta" = "the never falling"; "Dāmodara" = "the self-restrained"; "descendant of Yadu (Jadu)"; "eternal male"; "Foe of Madhu"; "Govinda" = "Rescuer of the Earth"; "he whose emblem is Garuḍa"; "holder of the conch, discus, and mace"; "Hṛṣīkeṣa" = "Lord of the Senses"; "Keśava" = "the long-haired one"; "Lord of the Universe"; "Lotus-eyed deity"; "Nārāyaṇa" = "the universal abode"; "Puruṣottama" = "the best of men"; "Vāsudeva" = "the Indweller".

Rāma : "Balabhadra" = "he who is strong and fortunate"; "Baladeva" = "divinity of strength"; "Balarāma" = "Rāma the strong".

Sūrya : Āditya.

The Syamantaka Gem Story : Viṣṇu Purāṇa (Book IV, Chapter 13)

Ep. 1. (1, 1,—)

"On one occasion Satrājī, whilst walking along the sea shore, addressed his mind to Sūrya, and hymned his praises: on which the divinity appeared and stood before him. Beholding him in an indistinct shape, Satrājī said to the sun, "I have beheld thee, lord, in the heavens as a globe of fire: now

1. Dowson, J., *A Classical Dictionary of Hindu Mythology*, Routledge, Kegan Paul, French and Trubner, London, 1928, pp. 315f.

do thou show favour unto me, that I may see thee in thy proper form." On this the sun taking the jewel called Syamantaka from off his neck, placed it apart, and Satrājīṭ beheld him of a dwarfish stature, with a body like burnished copper, and with slightly reddish eyes. Having offered his adorations, the sun desired him to demand a boon, and he requested that the jewel might become his. The sun presented it to him, and then resumed his place in the sky. Having obtained the spotless gem of gems, Satrājīṭ wore it on his neck, and becoming as brilliant thereby as the sun himself, irradiating all the region with his splendour, he returned to Dvārakā. The inhabitants of that city, beholding him approach, repaired to the eternal male, Puruṣottama, who, to sustain the burden of the earth, had assumed a mortal form (as Kṛṣṇa), and said to him, "Lord, assuredly the divine sun is coming to visit you." But Kṛṣṇa smiled, and said, "It is not the divine sun, but Satrājīṭ, to whom Āditya has presented the Syamantaka gem, and he now wears it : go and behold him without apprehension." Accordingly they departed. Satrājīṭ having gone to his house, there deposited the jewel, which yielded daily eight loads of gold, and through its marvellous virtue dispelled all fear of portents, wild beasts, fire, robbers, and famine."

Ep. 2. (2, 2, 1)

"Acyuta was of opinion that this wonderful gem should be in the possession of Ugrasena; but although he had the power of taking it from Satrājīṭ, he did not deprive him of it, that he might not occasion any disagreement amongst the family. Satrājīṭ, on the other hand, fearing that Kṛṣṇa would ask him for the jewel, transferred it to his brother Prasena. Now it was the peculiar property of this jewel, that although it was an inexhaustible source of good to a virtuous person, yet when worn by a man of bad character it was the cause of his death. Prasena having taken the gem, and hung it round his neck, mounted his horse, and went to the woods to hunt. In the chase he was killed by a lion. The lion, taking the jewel in his mouth, was about to depart, when he was observed and killed by Jāmbavat, the king of the bears, who carrying off the gem retired into his cave, and gave it to his son Sukumāra to play with."

Ep. 3. (3, 3, 2)

“When these calumnious rumours came to the knowledge of Kṛṣṇa, he collected a number of the Yādavas, and accompanied by them pursued the course of Prasena by the impressions of his horse’s hoofs. Desirous of recovering the gem, he thence followed the steps of the lion, and at no great distance came to the place where the lion had been killed by the bear. Following the footmarks of the latter, he arrived at the foot of a mountain, where he desired the Yādavas to await him, whilst he continued the track. Still guided by the marks of the feet, he discovered a cavern, and had scarcely entered it when he heard the nurse of Sukumāra saying to him, “The lion killed Prasena; the lion has been killed by Jāmbavat : weep not, Sukumāra, the Syamantaka is your own.” Thus assured of his object, Kṛṣṇa advanced into the cavern, and saw the brilliant jewel in the hands of the nurse, who was giving it as a plaything to Sukumāra. The nurse soon descried his approach, and marking his eyes fixed upon the gem with eager desire, called loudly for help. Hearing her cries, Jāmbavat, full of anger, came to the cave, and a conflict ensued between him and Acyuta, which lasted twenty-one days. The Yādavas who had accompanied the latter waited seven or eight days in expectation of his return, but as the foe of Madhu still came not forth, they concluded that he must have met his death in the cavern. “It could not have required so many days,” they thought “to overcome an enemy;” and accordingly they departed, and returned to Dvārakā, and announced that Kṛṣṇa had been killed.”

Ep. 4. (4, 4, 2)

“When the relations of Acyuta heard this intelligence, they performed all the obsequial rites suited to the occasion. The food and water thus offered to Kṛṣṇa in the celebration of his Śrāddha served to support his life, and invigorate his strength in the combat in which he was engaged; whilst his adversary, wearied by daily conflict with a powerful foe, bruised and battered in every limb by heavy blows, and enfeebled by want of food, became unable longer to resist him. Overcome by his mighty antagonist, Jāmbavat cast himself before him and said, “Thou, mighty being, art surely

invincible by all the demons, and by the spirits of heaven, earth, or hell; much less art thou to be vanquished by mean and powerless creatures in a human shape; and still less by such as we are, who are born of brute origin. Undoubtedly thou art a portion of my sovereign lord Nārāyaṇa, the defender of the universe." Thus addressed by Jāmbavat, Kṛṣṇa explained to him fully that he had descended to take upon himself the burden of the earth, and kindly alleviated the bodily pain which the bear suffered from the fight, by touching him with his hand. Jāmbavat again prostrated himself before Kṛṣṇa, and presented to him his daughter Jāmbavatī, as an offering suitable to a guest. He also delivered to his visitor the Syamantaka jewel. Although a gift from such an individual was not fit for his acceptance, yet Kṛṣṇa took the gem for the purpose of clearing his reputation. He then returned along with his bride Jāmbavatī to Dvārakā.

When the people of Dvārakā beheld Kṛṣṇa alive and returned, they were filled with delight, so that those who were bowed down with years recovered youthful vigour; and all the Yādavas, men and women, assembled round Ānakadundubhi, the father of the hero, and congratulated him.

Ep. 5. (5, 5, 3)

"Kṛṣṇa related to the whole assembly of the the Yādavas all that had happened, exactly as it had befallen, and restoring the Syamantaka jewel to Satrājīt was exonerated from the crime of which he had been falsely accused. He then led Jāmbavatī into the inner apartments.

When Satrājīt reflected that he had been the cause of the aspersions upon Kṛṣṇa's character, he felt alarmed, and to conciliate the prince he gave him to wife his daughter Satyabhāmā."

Ep. 6. (6, 7,-)

"The maiden had been previously sought in marriage by several of the most distinguished Yādavas, as Akrūra, Kṛtavarma and Śatadhanvan, who were highly incensed at her being wedded to another, and leagued in enmity against

Satrājīṭ. The chief amongst them, with Akrūra and Kṛtavarman, said to Śatadhanvan, "This caitiff Satrājīṭ has offered a gross insult to you, as well as to us who solicited his daughter, by giving her to Kṛṣṇa : let him not live : why do you not kill him, and take the jewel ? Should Acyuta therefore enter into feud with you, we will take your part." Upon this promise Śatadhanvan undertook to slay Satrājīṭ.

Ep. 7. (7, 6,-)

"When news arrived that the sons of Pāṇḍu had been burned in the house of wax¹⁰, Kṛṣṇa, who knew the real truth, set off for Bārāṇāvata to allay the animosity of Duryodhana, and to perform the duties his relationship required.

Ep. 8. (8, 7,-)

"Śatadhanvan taking advantage of his absence, killed Satrājīṭ in his sleep, and took possession of the gem. Upon this coming to the knowledge of Satyabhāmā, she immediately mounted her chariot, and, filled with fury at her father's murder, repaired to Bārāṇāvata, and told her husband how Satrājīṭ had been killed by Śatadhanvan in resentment of her having been married to another, and how he had carried off the jewel; and she implored him to take prompt measures to avenge such heinous wrong. Kṛṣṇa, who is ever internally placid being informed of these transactions, said to Satyabhāmā, as his eyes flashed with indignation, "Those are indeed audacious injuries, but I will not submit to them from so vile a wrath. They must assail the tree, who would kill the birds that there have built their nests. Dismiss excessive sorrow; it needs not your lamentations to excite any wrath." Returning forthwith to Dvārakā, Kṛṣṇa took Baladeva apart, and said to him, "A lion slew Prasena, hunting in the forests; and now Satrājīṭ has been murdered by Śatadhanvan. As both these are removed, the jewel which belonged to them is our common right. Up then, ascend your car and put Śatadhanvan to death."

Being thus excited by his brother, Balarāma engaged resolutely in the enterprise.

Ep. 9. (9, 8,-)

"But Śatadhanvan, being aware of their hostile designs, repaired to Kṛtavarman, and required his assistance. Kṛta-

varman, however, declined to assist him, pleading his inability to engage in a conflict with both Baladeva and Kṛṣṇa. Śatadhanvan thus disappointed, applied to Akrūra; but he said, "You must have recourse to some other protector. How should I be able to defend you? There is no one even amongst the immortals, whose praises are celebrated throughout the universe, who is capable of contending with the wielder of the discus, at the stamp of whose feet the three worlds tremble; whose hand makes the wives of the Asuras widows, whose weapons no host, however mighty, can resist; no one is capable of encountering the wielder of the ploughshare, who annihilates the prowess of his enemies by the glances of his eyes, that roll with the joys of wine; and whose vast ploughshare manifests his might, by seizing and exterminating the most formidable foes." "Since this is the case," replied Śatadhanvan, "and you are unable to assist me, at least accept and take care of this jewel." "I will do so," answered Akrūra, "If you promise that even in the last extremity you will not divulge its being in my possession." To this Śatadhanvan agreed, and Akrūra took the jewel; and the former mounting a very swift mare, one that could travel a hundred leagues a day, fled from Dvārakā.

When Kṛṣṇa heard of Śatadhanvan's flight, he harnessed his four horses, Śaivya, Sugrīva, Meghapuṣpa, and Balāhaka, to his car, and accompanied by Balarāma, set off in pursuit. The mare held her speed, and accomplished her hundred leagues; but when she reached the country of Mithilā, her strength was exhausted, and she dropped down and died. Śatadhanvan¹¹ dismounting, continued his flight on foot. When his pursuers came to the place where the mare had perished, Kṛṣṇa said to Balarāma, "Do you remain in the car, whilst I follow the villain on foot, and put him to death; the ground here is bad; and the horses will not be able to drag the chariot across it." Balarāma accordingly stayed with the car, and Kṛṣṇa followed Śatadhanvan on foot; when he had chased him for two *krośas*, he discharged his discus, and, although Śatadhanvan was at a considerable distance, the weapon struck off his head. Kṛṣṇa then coming up, searched his body and his dress for the Syamantaka jewel, but found

it not. He then returned to Balabhadra, and told him that they had effected the death of Śatadhanvan to no purpose, for the precious gem, the quintessence of all worlds, was not upon his person. When Balabhadra heard this, he flew into a violent rage, and said to Vāsudeva, "Shame light upon you, to be thus greedy of wealth ! I acknowledge no brotherhood with you. Here lies my path. Go whither you please; I have done with Dvārakā, with you, with all our house. It is of no use to seek to impose upon me with thy perjuries." Thus reviling his brother, who fruitlessly endeavoured to appease him, Balabhadra went to the city of Videha, where Janaka received him hospitably, and there he remained. Vāsudeva returned to Dvārakā. It was during his stay in the dwelling of Janaka that Duryodhana, the son of Dhṛtarāṣṭra, learned from Balabhadra the art of fighting with the mace. At the expiration of three years, Ugrasena and other chiefs of the Yādavas, being satisfied that Kṛṣṇa had not the jewel, went to Videha, and removed Balabhadra's suspicions, and brought him home.

Ep. 10. (10, 9, 4)

"Akrūra, carefully considering the treasures which the precious jewel secured to him, constantly celebrated religious rites, and, purified with holy prayers lived in affluence for fifty-two years; and through the virtue of that gem there was no dearth nor pestilence in the whole country. At the end of that period, Śatrughna, the great grandson of Sātvata, was killed by the Bhojas, and as they were in bonds of alliance with Akrūra, he accompanied them in their flight from Dvārakā. From the moment of his departure various calamities, portents, snakes, dearth, plague, and the like, began to prevail; so that he whose emblem is Garuḍa called together the Yādavas, with Balabhadra and Ugrasena, and recommended them to consider how it was that so many prodigies should have occurred at the same time. On this Andhaka, one of the elders of the Yadu race, thus spoke : "Wherever Śvaphalka, the father of Akrūra, dwelt, there famine, plague, dearth, and other visitations were unknown. Once when there was want of rain in the kingdom of Kāśirāja, Śvaphalka was brought there, and immediately there fell rain from the

heavens. It happened also that the queen of Kāśirāja conceived, and was quick with a daughter; but when the time of delivery arrived, the child issued not from the womb. Twelve years passed away, and still the girl was unborn. Then Kāśirāja spoke to the child, and said, 'Daughter, why is your birth thus delayed? Come forth; I desire to behold you, why do you inflict this protracted suffering upon your mother? Thus addressed, the infant answered, 'If, father, you will present a cow every day to the Brāhmaṇas, I shall of the end of three years more be born.' The king accordingly presented daily a cow to the Brāhmaṇa, and at the end of three years the damsel came into the world. Her father called her Gāndinī, and he subsequently gave her to Śvaphalka, when he came to his palace for his benefit. Gāndinī, as long as she lived, gave a cow to the Brāhmaṇas every day. Akrūra was her son by Śvaphalka, and his birth therefore proceeds from a combination of uncommon excellence. When a person such as he is, absent from us, is it likely that famine, pestilence, and prodigies should fail to occur? Let him then be invited to return; the faults of men of exalted worth must not be too severely scrutinized."

Agreeably to the advice of Andhaka, the older, the Yādavas sent a mission headed by Keśava, Ugrasena, and Balabhadra, to assure Akrūra that no notice would be taken of any irregularity committed by him; and having satisfied him that he was in no danger, they brought him back to Dvārakā.

Ep. 11. (11,9[107],-)

"Immediately on his arrival, in consequence of the properties of the jewel, the plague, dearth, famine, and every other calamity and portent, ceased. Kṛṣṇa, observing this, reflected that the descen of Akrūra from Gāndinī and Śvaphalka was a cause wholly disproportionate to such an effect, and that some powerful influence must be exerted to arrest pestilence and famine. "Of a surety," said he to himself, "the great Syamantaka jewel is in his keeping, for such I have heard are amongst its properties. This Akrūra too has been lately celebrating sacrifice after sacrifice; his own means are insufficient for such expenses; it is beyond a doubt that he

has the jewel." Having come to this conclusion, he called a meeting of all the Yādavas at his house, under the pretext of some festive celebration. When they were all seated, and the purport of their assembling had been explained, and the business accomplished, Kṛṣṇa entered into conversation with Akrūra, and after laughing and joking, said to him, "Kinsman, you are a very prince in your liberality; but we know very well that the precious jewel which was stolen by Sudhanvan was delivered by him to you, and is now in your possession, to the great benefit of this kingdom. So let it remain; we all derive advantage from its virtues. But Balabhadra suspects that I have it, and therefore, out of kindness to me, show it to the assembly." When Akrūra, who had the jewel with him, was thus taxed, he hesitated what he should do. "If I deny that I have the jewel," thought he, "they will search my person, and find the gem hidden amongst my clothes. I cannot submit to a search." So reflecting, Akrūra said to Nārāyaṇa, the cause of the whole world, "It is true that the Syamantaka jewel was entrusted to me by Śatadhanvan, when he went from here. I expected every day that you would ask me for it, and with much inconvenience therefore I have kept it, until now. The charge of it has subjected me to so much anxiety, that I have been incapable of enjoying any pleasure, and have never known a moment's ease. Afraid that you would think me unfit to retain possession of a jewel so essential to the welfare of the kingdom, I forbore to mention to you its being in my hands; but now take it yourself, and give the care of it to whom you please." Having thus spoken, Akrūra drew forth from his garments a small gold box, and took from it the jewel. On displaying it to the assembly of the Yādavas, the whole chamber where they sat was illuminated by its radiance. "This", said Akrūra, "is the Syamantaka gem, which was consigned to me by Śatadhanvan : let him to whom it belongs now take it."

When the Yādavas beheld the jewel, they were filled with astonishment, and loudly expressed their delight. Balabhadra immediately claimed the jewel as his property jointly with Acyuta, as formerly agreed upon; whilst Satyabhama demanded it as her right, as it had originally belonged to her

father. Between these two Kṛṣṇa considered himself as an ox between the two wheels of a cart, and thus spoke to Akrūra in the presence of all the Yādavas : "This jewel has been exhibited to the assembly in order to clear my reputation; it is the joint right of Balabhadra and myself, and is the patrimonial inheritance of Satyabhāmā. But this jewel, to be of advantage to the whole kingdom, should be taken charge of by a person who leads a life of perpetual continence : If worn by an impure individual, it will be the cause of his death. Now as I have sixteen thousand wives, I am not qualified to have the care of it. It is not likely that Satyabhāmā will agree the condition that would entitle her to the possession of the jewel; and as to Balabhadra, he is too much addicted to wine and the pleasures of sense to lead a life of self-denial. We are therefore out of the question, and all the Yādavas, Balabhadra, Satyabhāmā, and myself, request you, most bountiful Akrūra, to retain the care of the jewel, as you have done hitherto, for the general good; for you are qualified to have the keeping of it, and in your hands it has been productive of benefit to the country. You must not decline compliance with our request." Akrūra, thus urged, accepted the jewel, and thenceforth wore it publicly round his neck, where it shone with dazzling brightness; and Akrūra moved about like the sun, wearing a garland of light.

Moral :

He who calls to mind the vindication of the character of Kṛṣṇa from false aspersions, shall never become the subject of unfounded accusation in the least degree, and living in the full exercise of his senses shall be cleansed from every sin.

B. Analysis :

Giving-Taking.

Let us examine the constituent units of our story as they occur in Table I beginning with the "giving" column. The story opens by Sūrya giving the Syamantaka Gem to Satrājī (1.1); Satrājī, in turn, gives the Syamantaka Gem to Prasena (2.4) and so on down the list. We might notice that two kinds of gifts are given—the Syamantaka Gem which, we have mentioned in inci-

ents 1.1, 2.4, 2.9, 5.17, 9.23, 4.15, 5.19, and women as wives, Jāmbavatī and Satyabhāmā both to Kṛṣṇa from their respective fathers Jāmbavat and Satrājit. (The *Matsya Purāṇa* records that Satyabhāmā was Satrājit's grand-daughter rather than his daughter). Likewise in column II, headed "taking", we listed such incidents as a Lion's taking the Syamantaka Gem from Prasena (2.6) and so on as well as attempts (though failures) at taking in varying degrees of attempt—Kṛṣṇa takes no Syamantaka Gem from Śatadhanvan (9.25). (He tried and failed) as well as Kṛṣṇa's thinking that Ugrasena should have the Syamantaka Gem where Kṛṣṇa knows that he could take it if he had really wanted to (2.3). In 9.25 Kṛṣṇa fails to take the Syamantaka Gem from Śatadhanvan though he tries, while in 2.3 Kṛṣṇa fails to take the Syamantaka Gem though he contemplates trying. All the "takings" involve the Syamantaka Gem it will be noted. We might also note that the entries 4.15 with 3.12 and 11.34 in the "giving and taking" columns seem to mediate between both columns. We might rename the first column "Offering Possession" while the second would be named "Seizing Possession". Thus 4.15 with 3.12 and 11.34 consist in incidents in which both offering and seizing possession coincide though not in the same ways. In 4.15, Jāmbavat gives Kṛṣṇa the Syamantaka Gem after Kṛṣṇa has fought Jāmbavat and has attempted to seize possession of the Syamantaka Gem (3.12). In 11.34 Akrūra simultaneously attempts to give the Syamantaka Gem to Kṛṣṇa after Kṛṣṇa has cajoled and accused Akrūra of possessing it but keeps it instead. Akrūra would have had the Syamantaka Gem taken from him had anyone proved worthy—eg. Kṛṣṇa or Satyabhāmā, but no one took the gem from Akrūra. 4.15 and 3.12 combine both giving and taking columns because they are both a separated giving and taking while 11.34 straddles the columns because Akrūra's "keeping" of the gem is midway between giving and taking or because "possession" is midway between "offering possession" and "seizing possession". It is properly neither giving nor taking, and in the story is seen as a keeping which was preceded by an attempted but failed giving on Akrūra's part and a desired but failed taking on the parts of Kṛṣṇa, Balārāma and Satyabhāmā.

From a structural point of view, the travels of the Syamantaka Gem cease once it rests with an individual in a situation which lies "halfway between" giving and taking in a certain sense which

we have specified. The pendulum swings from giving to taking only to come to rest at the midpoint between them. If one poses the problem of the myth as “When will the Syamantaka Gem find a stable resting place?” one seems to find the myth giving the answer—“in a situation which is neither a giving nor a taking : a keeping”, because in the myth it is only when Akrūra can fail to give the Syamantaka and when others fail to take it that the Syamantaka Gem is insured an end to its wanderings. In a sense the model for this successful conclusion to the Giving-Taking dichotomy (11.34) is found in 4.15 and 3.12 as its “inverse”. The “inverse” of 4.14 and 3.12, both giving and taking is (11.34) : neither giving nor taking.

We might bring out the mediating quality of 11.34 by contrasting it to two other taking-situations in which Kṛṣṇa is the principal actor. It is also noteworthy that these incidents—2.3 and 9.25, stand opposed to one another as if they were to be understood as two extreme alternatives of the same operation taking. Let us think about these opposed taking-situations in order to bring out the fitting quality of their “solution” in 11.34.

These “takings” involve Kṛṣṇa in two curiously similar, yet importantly different acts. In 2.3, Kṛṣṇa is seen to have the conviction that Ugrasena should have the Syamantaka Gem rather than Satrajit. Kṛṣṇa is depicted as having not only the power to take the Syamantaka Gem but also having entertained the desire. Satrajit, on the other hand, does not wish Kṛṣṇa to have the Syamantaka Gem and gives it to Prasena (2.4) in order to avoid having to surrender the Syamantaka Gem to Kṛṣṇa. We might therefore call 2.3 an “undertaking” because Kṛṣṇa’s inaction results in his withdrawal from seizure of the Syamantaka Gem. It is a kind of failed seizure—a taking which fails because of a kind of prophylaxis of action. On the other hand, the failure to seize the Syamantaka Gem from Śatadhanvan in 9.25 is an example of a taking which fails because Śatadhanvan does not have the Syamantaka Gem, though Kṛṣṇa kills and searches him for it. He attempts as much as possible to seize the Syamantaka Gem, but fails not only though he tries (too) hard (“over-taking”) but because Śatadhanvan does not possess the Syamantaka Gem. Viewing

these cases 2.3 and 9.25, where failure to seize and possess the Syamantaka Gem seems to be common features, though the reasons for failure in each case are different, 3.12 (in association with 4.15) seems to offer a model of a successful taking (as does 11.34 in its own way). By linking 3.12 with 4.15 our story seems to say that possession of the Syamantaka Gem is possible and successful when the taking of the Gem is associated with its being given. Where desire is too weak (2.3) or too strong (9.25) failure ensues. This, of course, is to simplify, for the association of 3.12 and 4.15 is only a partial success—the Gem is stolen again and Kṛṣṇa's reputation slurred. For this reason 11.34 (neither giving nor taking) "Having" is needed to halt the wanderings of the Gem—both its givings and its takings and the subsequent social and theological instability which result. We would do well to keep in mind this preference for the mediator between extremes as we move on to our next pair of bundled relations.

If our general conclusion about the myth's attempt to neutralize or mediate the Giving-Taking dichotomy be correct, perhaps an inspection of the objects of exchange will reinforce our conclusions. The principal object of exchange—the Syamantaka Gem—is itself an ambivalent article *par excellence*. It brings welfare if possessed by a good man and ill-fare if possessed by an evil man. As a mediating object—an interloper between giver and object of giving, taker and object of taking, the Syamantaka Gem manifests the dual character of the mediator. Less obvious are the ambiguous and contradictory qualities of the other objects of exchange: Jāmbavatī and Satyabhāmā. Not only are both wives figures of internal contradiction but each one is an "inversion" of the other. Thus Jāmbavatī and Satyabhāmā, both media between Kṛṣṇa and the outside world, are characters whose constitution reveals the myth's tendency to resolve dichotomous oppositions as 11.34 has thus far done with respect to the Giving-Taking dichotomy as a whole.

Let us consider then the "inversions" between Jāmbavatī and Satyabhāmā and the mediations they effect. The situations in which they are given to Kṛṣṇa, first of all, are strikingly different. In Jāmbavatī's case she is given to Kṛṣṇa along with the Syamantaka Gem; it is a private affair (in Jāmbavatī's cave), which is located inside Mount Rkṣa, the source of five rivers.¹ In Satyabhāmā's

1. Patil, D. R., p. 85.

case, she is given to Kṛṣṇa after (and somehow in exchange for the Syamantaka Gem) the Syamantaka Gem is given to Satrājī by Kṛṣṇa; it is a public affair (occurring, as it were, openly in Dvārakā) which is located by the sea, the goal of rivers

More striking perhaps are the differences between Jāmbavatī and Satyabhāmā themselves. Jāmbavatī though a bear, a being of nature, is passive and docile throughout, therefore upsetting expectations normally associated with nature. She is given to Kṛṣṇa, is led into his apartments (Ep. 5) by him, and is not heard of thereafter. Satyabhāmā on the other hand though human and a being of culture is active and passionate throughout, also upsetting expectations normally associated with culture. She fetches Kṛṣṇa in Bārāṇāvata and attempts to excite his wrath against Śatadhanvan, the murderer of her father Satrājī. She is quick to demand the Syamantaka Gem as her patrimonial inheritance when the possession of it is put into question in 11.34. It is not insignificant, we would suggest, that in the *Mahābhārata* Satyabhāmā is also cast in an active role with respect to the revenging of Satrājī's death. We quote :

Then Sātyaki informed the slayer of Madhu as to how Kṛtavarman had behaved towards Satrājī for taking away from him the celebrated gem *Syamantaka*. Hearing the narrative, Satyabhāmā, giving way to wrath and tears, approached Keśava and sitting on his lap enhanced his anger (for Kṛtavarman).¹

In short, Satyabhāmā is seen as an active instigator to Kṛṣṇa's actions while Jāmbavatī is passive with respect to Kṛṣṇa throughout.

Paradoxically, but understandably, both Jāmbavatī and Satyabhāmā terminate their lives after Kṛṣṇa's death, in ways which are not only "inversions" of one another (in keeping with what we have said above) but also as "inversions" of their previous behaviors.² Thus Jāmbavatī, a passive being of nature (itself an

1. *The Mahābhārata : Mausala-parvan*, p. 7. (XVI, 3, 79).

2. Sorenson, S, *An Index to the Names in the Mahābhārata*, Williams and Norgate, London, 1925, Jambavati : p. 348; Satyabhama : p. 625.

inner "inversion") ends her days "inversely" as they were lived by ascending Kṛṣṇa's funeral pyre—by doing "satī": an active, cultural deed having connexions with sacrifice.¹ Satyabhāmā, an active being of culture (another inner "inversion") becomes a forest ascetic (contemplation: the "inverse" of sacrifice): a passive deed, having connections with nature—the forest. The "inverse" termini: "satī" and forest asceticism, can be further analyzed in terms of the constituent inversions implicit in them: "satī" requires the use of wood which has been acted upon by men (culture)—made into firewood, logs which are destroyed by flames—burnt. Forest asceticism involves wood as well—but trees not acted upon by men (nature) which are living—growing in a forest.

Therefore, Jāmbavatī and Satyabhāmā stand as "inverses" of one another not only in their presented modes of behavior and in their "natures" as well but with respect to the contradictions between their "natures" and their subsequent behaviors. They not only originate "inverse" kinds of being but end "inversely" to one another and to their previous modes of behavior. Thus we can schematize the transformations as follows:

	Usual Behavior	End State "Satī"
	appearance : (passive) culture	(active) culture
Jāmbavatī :	reality : nature	nature
	Usual Behaviour	End State Forest Asceticism
	appearance : (active) nature	(passive) nature
Satyabhāmā :	reality : culture	culture

Let us recapitulate the results of this first stage of our analysis. We have noticed how major oppositions under the "Giving-Taking" rubric have achieved resolution. In general, 11.34 ("Having") mediates and neutralizes the opposition between "giving and taking" the Syamantaka Gem. This is an ambivalent condition neither properly describable as "giving" or "taking" but

1. Renou, L., *The Civilization of Ancient India*, second edition, Susil Gupta, Calcutta, 1959, pp. 67 f.

as "having." We also noticed that the success of the mediating states—whether the tentative 4.15—3.12 or the final 11.34, was highlighted by the failure of two opposite and less ambiguous attempts at taking the gem in 2.3 and 9.25. In observing that states of mediation are ambiguous ones (11.34) we noticed that objects of mediation also shared this ambiguity. The Syamantaka Gem and the two wives Kṛṣṇa wins in the story—Jāmbavatī and Satyabhāmā, are prime examples of this insight.

Accusing-Exonerating

The second pair of constituent unit oppositions that we detect in our story involve the bundles of relations "accusing" and "exonerating." We might recall that it was the accusation by the Yādavas that Kṛṣṇa stole the Gem and murdered Prasena (2.10) which set into motion Kṛṣṇa's attempts to secure the Gem from Jāmbavat and the struggles, givings and takings that followed on in pursuit of the vindication of his reputation, his acquittal. It would not be unreasonable of us to see in Kṛṣṇa's quest for moral acquittal (or in the problem of Kṛṣṇa's acquittal) a major theme of our myth. Indeed this was the view of the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa's* ancient commentator, who sees the point of the Syamantaka Gem story to be a working out of Kṛṣṇa's vindication of character.¹ In illuminating the structure of this second pair of bundled relations, we can link its successful resolution—(11.33) Kṛṣṇa's full exoneration by one and all, and its means (11.32) with the pattern of resolution we found in the first pair of bundled relations—11.34, thus coming closer to a unified interpretation of all the bundled relations in the Syamantaka Gem story.

To proceed then with our analysis, we notice that on two distinct occasions (2.10 and 9.26) Kṛṣṇa is accused of having taken the Gem and of being guilty of the murder of its possessor. Structurally, these accusation-situations display a kind of symmetry. In 2.10, the community, (the Yādavas) explicitly and directly accuse

1. The commentator—editor of the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* states the theme of the Syamantaka Gem Story as :

He, who calls to mind the vindication of the character of Kṛṣṇa from false aspersions, shall never become the subject of unfounded accusation in the least degree, and living in the full exercise of his senses shall be cleansed from every sin,

Kṛṣṇa while an individual, Satrājī, implicitly and directly accuses him of the same offences. In 9.26, an individual, Balarāma, explicitly and directly levels accusations against Kṛṣṇa while the community (the Yādavas) do so implicitly and indirectly. In both cases the tone of the accusations is inhospitable and entails moral condemnation of Kṛṣṇa's behavior.

The structures of the exoneration-situations differ similarly with 3.11 and 5.18 reflecting 2.10's primarily communal accusation with an acquittal equally communal and public. In 5.20 Satrājī implicitly exonerates Kṛṣṇa of any relevant crimes—implicitly admitting his own error in accusing Kṛṣṇa by giving his daughter Satyabhāmā in marriage to Kṛṣṇa (5.19) over those with prior claims. 9.27's acquittal of Kṛṣṇa reflects the personal nature of the 9.26 accusation but on the whole is far from a complete acquittal of Kṛṣṇa. In episode 11 Kṛṣṇa maintains that Balarāma still harbors doubts as to his innocence in the matter of the secreting of the Syamantaka Gem and that therefore Akrūra should produce the Gem before the Yādava assembly and Balarāma. We must therefore regard the acquittal in 9.27 as a tentative one—awaiting fuller confirmation at a later date. It may be seen as an acquittal in *deed* but not of heart—Balarāma is convinced sufficiently to return to Dvārakā, the Yādavas do have commerce with Kṛṣṇa but until the Gem is produced, a cloud of doubt hangs over Kṛṣṇa's reputation. If the Gem can be produced and its absence from Śatadhanvan's possession can be explained, then Kṛṣṇa's reputation can be vindicated.

Exoneration, though again toned down does come for Kṛṣṇa (11.33) and it is worth noticing what this amounts to and how this is achieved, in terms of the dialectic of accusation and exoneration. We will see subsequently that this successful acquittal is also related to our final pair of bundled relations, "Destroying" and "Preserving", but first we want to consider how Kṛṣṇa's exoneration is worked out in its own terms. In a sense, the myth has presented us with situations in which aspersion is cast upon Kṛṣṇa's reputation from both community and individual in different variations of stress : 2.10 stressing community accusation; 9.26 stressing individual accusation. Poor Kṛṣṇa, the subject of public rumour and individual abuse, must suffer two acquittals : first the combination 3.11, 5.18 and 5.20, and later 9.27—neither of which prevent further

slurs on his character from arising ! The first acquittal, which may be seen as a lumping of 3.11, 5.18 and 5.20, evidently means little to Kṛṣṇa's fellows, for Balarāma outlandishly accuses him again in 9.26 and the Yādavas concur with Balarāma against Kṛṣṇa in this attack on his character. The acquittal in 9.27, as we have noted, is incomplete—it merely amounts to a suspended sentence and barely an acquittal at all. How, our myth seems to ask, is Kṛṣṇa to gain *full* exoneration ?

Structurally, the beginning of the answer to this problem is given in 11.32, in the same way that the association of 3.12 and 4.15 offered an answer to the problem of how to possess the Syamantaka Gem. As 4.15 and 3.12 were *both* a giving and a taking, so also is 11.32 *both* an accusation and an acquittal (as well as being neither an accusing nor an acquitting as we will see). Kṛṣṇa *accuses* Akrūra of having the Gem and of having received it from Śatadhanvan, yet by his hospitality implicitly holds out an *acquittal* for the part Akrūra had in conspiring over Śatadhanvan's death and the circumstances of his possessing the Gem. By this partial similarity between the solutions in 3.12-4.15 and 11.32 the myth weaves together structurally the first two pairs of bundled relations of which it is composed. Giving-Taking is structurally related to Accusing-Exonerating because the solutions to both are associations or mediations of their respective dichotomies.

What remains to be explained however is the relationship between 11.34, neither giving nor taking, and 11.32, both accusing and acquitting. One explanation might rely on the following insight into the relationships between 4.15-3.12 and 11.34 and 9.26-9.27 and 11.32—between the temporary solution to Giving-Taking (4.15-3.12) and its final solution (11.34) and between the tentative solution to accusing-exonerating (9.27) and its correlative accusation (9.26) and the final solution here (11.32). Thus, the following relations may be set up as follows.

$$\frac{4.15 + 3.12}{11.34} = \frac{9.26 + 9.27}{11.32}$$

one gives to Kṛṣṇa + Kṛṣṇa takes from one one gives NOT to Kṛṣṇa + Kṛṣṇa takes NOT from one	=	one accuses Kṛṣṇa + one acquits Kṛṣṇa Kṛṣṇa accuses one + Kṛṣṇa acquits one
--	---	--

11.34 is the compound negation of 4.15 and 3.12 while 11.32 is the compound converse of 9.26 and 9.27. Though negation and conversion are different logical operations—one being a change in the kind of predication and the other being a transposition of terms, one might still accept that 11.34 and 11.32 are similar in that they both attempt reversals of the previous incidents: 4.15-3.12 and 9.26-9.27—though, we admit, in different ways.

11.34 and 11.32 bear stronger resemblances if we notice that 11.32 is more like 11.34 than we have hitherto allowed. Kṛṣṇa's accusing one and Kṛṣṇa's acquitting one are both of the weak variety like Akrūra's not giving the Syamantaka Gem to Kṛṣṇa and Kṛṣṇa's not taking the Gem from Akrūra. If "Having" or "Keeping" was advanced as the means between the poles of 11.34: "Offering Possession" and "Seizing Possession", then perhaps we can see in Kṛṣṇa's charge that Akrūra has the Syamantaka Gem and the acquittal implicit in his cajoling behavior here as describing another mediating state which is harder to name. Between, say, the poles of "Impugning Honor" and "Restoring Honor" there is simply the state—"Honoring"—which may properly characterize the overall effect of Kṛṣṇa's treatment of Akrūra in 11.32: Kṛṣṇa states that Akrūra has the Gem etc., though Akrūra is not charged with moral transgressions; Kṛṣṇa implies that Akrūra's transgressions are forgotten without openly exonerating Akrūra. In a way, Kṛṣṇa neither accuses nor does not accuse Akrūra; nor does Kṛṣṇa acquit or not acquit Akrūra—yet does all at the same time in different senses. More precisely Kṛṣṇa "honors" Akrūra—establishes a mean between these various alternatives which succeeds in bringing Kṛṣṇa exoneration.

Similarly we may notice an analogous formal resemblance with respect to the final state of Kṛṣṇa in 11.33. This state (11.33) might arguably merit a position "between" the "Accusing" and "Exonerating" columns as 11.34 has done with respect to the "Giving" and "Taking" columns. Kṛṣṇa's final state might then quite plausibly be interpreted as we have interpreted Akrūra's: as the neutral "honoring" rather than simple "exonerating" ("restoring honor"). It might be noticed that episode 11 as well as making no accusation of Kṛṣṇa makes Kṛṣṇa's exoneration implicit. In a sense, 11.33 for Kṛṣṇa is more like neither being accused nor

exonerated but merely being “honored” since his innocence is not proclaimed and is left for the commentator to state as a moral.

In summary of our analysis of the “Accusing-Exonerating” pair of bundled relations we have noted three major oppositions : 1.—Accusing—Exonerating opposition 2.—Primarily communal accusation and exoneration in 2.10 and 3.11, 5.18 opposed to primarily individual accusation and exoneration in 9.26, 9.27, though we saw that an individual dimension was respectively involved secondarily in 2.10, 3.11, 5.18, as well as a communal dimension to 9.26 and 9.27. 3.—11.32’s opposition to 9.26 and 9.27 was noted as consisting in the former’s synthetic combination of elements distinguished in 9.26 and 9.27, with a conversion of Kṛṣṇa’s role from accused to accuser and acquitted to acquitter—leading directly to Kṛṣṇa’s final and full acquittal.

Along with oppositions we noticed the formal similarity between 4.15-3.12 and 11.32 while also considering 11.32’s similarity to 11.34 in their creating new categories of stability.

Thus, we have noticed how the “Accusing”—“Exonerating” oppositions have gained a certain resolution in the final situations of Akrūra and Kṛṣṇa. Both achieve happy end-states by, as it were, mediating the poles of the oppositions involved. In being “honored” both Akrūra and Kṛṣṇa stand in situations midway between having their honors impugned and restored. In this way the end-states of Akrūra and Kṛṣṇa with respect to the “Accusing”—“Exonerating” relationships (11.32, 11.33) resemble the resolution of the “Giving”—“Taking” columns (11.34) in that as mediations of the given extremes they are similar.

Destroying-Preserving

Finally we would analyze the last opposed pair of bundled relations : “Destroying-Preserving”. This opposition takes in on the Destroying side not only literal killing—the Lion kills Prasena (2.5), Jāmbavat kills the Lion (2.7) etc. but (a) physical struggle—possible though not actual killings—Kṛṣṇa struggles and subdues Jāmbavat (3-4.13) and (b) mental struggle or aggression—Kṛṣṇa’s prodding of Akrūra, causing Akrūra, causing Akrūra to admit his possession of the Syamantaka Gem. One might also count the befalling upon Dvārakā of the various calamities which ensue upon


the Syamantaka Gem's removal from Dvārakā as an example of "Destroying". One might also term this column of bundled relations as "Violent or Destructive Behaviour" to be opposed by "Sustaining or Constructive Behaviour". In the "Preserving" class we count such constructive events as (a) the presence of the Syamantaka Gem in Dvārakā and the resulting preservation from harm which it brings (1.2, 4.16, 10.28, 11.3.), (b) Kṛṣṇa's healing of Jāmbavat's wounds (4.14) and (c) Kṛṣṇa's hospitable reception of Akrūra (in 11.32) which acts as a sustaining of Akrūra's honour—an affirmation of Akrūra's integrity and reputation. It is Kṛṣṇa's ability, we would submit, to straddle these two opposing approaches (in 11.32) which, together with and indeed simultaneously with his resolution of the accusation and exoneration opposition, which wins for him final exoneration (11.33). 11.32 represents a grand synthetic moment in which not only is Kṛṣṇa's exoneration achieved (the goal of the story from the commentator's viewpoint) but it is achieved at the same time as he resolves the tensions within his own being—those between Destroying and Preserving, between the use of power to threaten, fight, and kill and the ability to foster, sustain and support. In 11.32, from the point of view of this opposition, we will see how Kṛṣṇa resolves this precarious dilemma of having to act destructively—to accuse and prod, while nevertheless needing to sustain and support him whom Kṛṣṇa is pitted against. This dilemma is resolved by Kṛṣṇa and, as we will go on to argue, has important ramifications and confirmations in the theological and political contexts in which this story is set.

We would best go about understanding this "Destroying-Preserving" opposition by considering three mediations which Kṛṣṇa performs with varying degrees of destructive power and success between the community (Yādavas) and the three illicit possessors of the Syamantaka Gem: Jāmbavat, Śatadhanvan and Akrūra.

Mediation A [See the Diagram 1] is for Kṛṣṇa—a relatively successful one: he obtains exoneration, two wives, the devotion of Jāmbavat and recovers the Gem for the community (and Satrajit). It also marks a mediation in which Kṛṣṇa's means of obtaining the Gem, though violent, are nonetheless moderate and merciful: though he struggles with Jāmbavat, he does show restraint (in the

Mediation A

Diagram 1.




Matsya Purāṇa, Kṛṣṇa kills Jāmbavat!) and heals Jāmbavat's wounds—3—4.13—4.14 mark a combination of Destruction and Preservation which harmonizes with the combination of Giving and Taking in 4.15 and 3.12.

On no view, however, does Mediation B [See the Diagram 2] prove successful for Kṛṣṇa, although he has increased the destructive element of his action to a superior degree in killing Śatadhanvan. Kṛṣṇa finds no Syamantaka Gem, nor do any good or blessings accrue to him (hence the broken lines in Diagram 2). His decidedly violent action in killing Śatadhanvan (8.21) brings, instead, the fraternal curse and accusation of Balarāma as well as disfavour with the community (9.26). If mediators are characterized by their ambivalent behaviour, as Levi-Strauss says¹, then Kṛṣṇa's one-sidedly violent behavior, lacking mercy (sustaining power to Śatadhanvan) may explain Kṛṣṇa's failure to succeed in mediating between Śatadhanvan and the community (the Yādavas).

1. Levi-Strauss, C., pp. 224 ff.

Mediation B


Diagram 2.



Not until Mediation C—the mediation between Akrūra and the Yādava community, does Kṛṣṇa become fully exonerated of his crimes and the Syamantaka Gem's wanderings cease—now to remain a source of welfare to the community.

Mediation C

Diagram 3.



Significantly, Kṛṣṇa's tack is one characterized by judicious use of pressure (destructive power) and flattery (sustaining power) (11. 32). Kṛṣṇa verily cajoles Akrūra into an admission of his possession of the Gem. Kṛṣṇa prods Akrūra with the knowledge of his possession of it (which implies for Akrūra a potential threat to search and consequent seizure of the Gem) so that Akrūra freely reveals his possession of the Gem (hence the wavy lines in Diagram 3). The similarity to 4.15 and 3.12 is striking: Jāmbavat freely relinquishes the Gem after Kṛṣṇa has tried to seize it. Closely associated with this incident is 3-4.13-4.14 which we have mentioned in our analysis of Mediation A. Kṛṣṇa's behavior is moderate—violent, yes, but with an equal dose of mercy and forbearance. 4.15-3.12 and 3-4.13-4.14 and 11.32 are all successful mediations for Kṛṣṇa, for in each the Syamantaka Gem is restored to a place which insures its benefit for the community and in both Kṛṣṇa receives vindication of his reputation.

If an immediate trend is to be seen in these mediations it is that, for Kṛṣṇa, increasing destructiveness in the pursuit of his aims spells a decreasing success in the attainment of these aims; the more violence is employed to vindicate his reputation and gain the Syamantaka Gem for communal benefit, the less these are achieved.


We might take the opportunity to link this solution of the "Destroying-Preserving" columns of bundled relations (11.32) with the solutions of the "Accusing-Exonerating" and "Giving-Taking" columns (11.32, 11.34 respectively) in order to compare their similarities. We have already observed how 4.15-3.12 (Giving-Taking) is linked to 3-4.13-4.14. As we have analyzed them, 11.32 for both pairs of columns bear the marks of moderation—of skilful use of means—not passive but active in a way which allows the accused or attacked freely to admit what he has been accused of or to surrender what he is being pressed for. In both cases, exoneration and preservation are offered implicitly in the same act.

We may look upon the end-states of Akrūra and Kṛṣṇa under all three pairs of relations as similar because each of these end-states marks a negation of the dichotomy within which it is defined. 11.34 finds Akrūra and Kṛṣṇa in a state of neutrality *vis-a-vis* "Giving" and "Taking". Despite Akrūra's willingness to give up

the Gem and despite the fact that it could have been taken from him, he neither gives up the Syamantaka Gem nor has it taken from him. Akrūra simply "has" or "keeps" it. Correspondingly Kṛṣṇa neither gives the Gem to Akrūra nor does he take it from him. Kṛṣṇa lets Akrūra keep it—he sanctions Akrūra's possession of the Gem. 11.32 and 11.33 under "Accusing" and "Exonerating" have similar structures. In 11.32 Akrūra is neither accused nor not accused, neither exonerated nor not exonerated. He is "honoured", as we noted earlier. Kṛṣṇa also analogously accuses and does not accuse Akrūra in 11.32 as well as exonerating and not exonerating him. Kṛṣṇa "honours" Akrūra. In so doing however Kṛṣṇa's exoneration (11.33) is cast in a different light—for in "honouring" Akrūra Kṛṣṇa himself is "honored"—in accepting the *status quo* he enjoys his rightful status without an explicit acquittal being made, as in the earlier cases. Kṛṣṇa's acquittal—toned down as it is in the text—has less the character of an extraordinary restoration of honour as a simple resumption of former habits of "honouring". Thus the "exonerations" of Akrūra and Kṛṣṇa both seem to take on neutral shades between the extremes of "Accusing" and "Exonerating". The unity of these mediations persists even across the "Destroying-Preserving" dichotomy. Akrūra is neither destroyed nor preserved by Kṛṣṇa's simultaneous destruction and preservation of him. Perhaps the best description of this situation is that Kṛṣṇa "lets Akrūra be". This view matches the mediations of "Destroying-Preserving" with those of "Giving-Taking" and "Accusing-Exonerating" since "Letting Be", "Having" and "Honouring" compare as mediations between their respective dichotomies.

Now we feel that our story can be seen to have a discernible structure which we have made explicit in its pairs of opposed relationships and their resolutions. The "Giving-Taking" dichotomy is resolved by the mediating incidents 4.15-3.12 and 11.34 : 4.15-3.12; mark Jāmbavat's giving the Gem to Kṛṣṇa after he has attempted to seize it from Jāmbavat and therefore achieves a resolution of the first dichotomy. 11.34 mediates the same dichotomy differently, though nonetheless effectively, by combining Akrūra's desired giving with the desired taking by Kṛṣṇa, Rāma and Satya-bhāmā. It also is the occasion of Akrūra's failure to give the Syamantaka Gem as well as the failure of any one to take it. In 11.32 Kṛṣṇa's simultaneous accusation and acquittal of Akrūra

mediates the "Accusing-Exonerating" opposition by also being characterizable as being neither of these two actions. The intermediate act of "honouring" successfully resolves the tension between accusing and exonerating not only for Akrūra but by participation for Kṛṣṇa in 11.33. As for "Destroying-Preserving" we again witness two mediations as was the case for "Giving-Taking." 3-4.13-4.14 finds Kṛṣṇa first "destroying" Jāmbavat, then "preserving" him. 11.32 finds Kṛṣṇa simultaneously "destroying" and "preserving" as well as neither destroying nor preserving Akrūra so that the mediating term "letting be" perhaps better describes the situation. We then might schematize the structure of our story's oppositions and resolutions as follows :



C. Meanings :

Now that we have laid out our story's structure we might speculate about what important meanings it might have (have had) in its more typical settings. More properly, however, we might say that our search is one for "themes" which are themes of the story. That a certain theme is a theme of the story is an historical property. Thus, our task is one which strives to suggest what themes historically might have been themes of the Syamantaka Gem story. History is indispensable for confirming the suggestions we would want to make. Fully testable, our suggestions are open to falsification as well as verification in theory—though

the practical possibility of both may be small. It is hoped, in spite of these limitations, that our "educated guesses" will prove somewhat useful in understanding the Syamantaka Gem Story and the possible meanings it might have had in its *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* setting.

Having said this, we would begin by considering two plausible themes for which there are some historical supports: the political and the religious. The political question which the myth attempts to answer can be briefly stated as follows: What are the proper means by which the ends of a member of an assembly of peers are to be achieved within that assembly? The political problem so posed is thus one of right behavior given a certain constitution of political life. That the Sātvatas of the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* were an "oligarchic or republican clan", known to Pāṇini as the Andhaka-Vṛṣṇis is the claim of Jayaswal in his *Hindu Polity*.¹ Whether or not an exact sense can be attached to the kind of political body our Sātvatas (Yādavas) might have been,² we can at least appreciate the importance of the assembly for their political life. It was a council of elders and leaders, apparently a forum for the discussion of major political issues and formation of policies; it was even a kind of jury and court of law. It would not therefore be unreasonable to expect that certain codes of conduct should be prescribed—especially to limit the influence a physically powerful individual (such as Kṛṣṇa) might want to exert. Councils are, after all, kinds of substitutes for brute struggle and exclude the use of physical force in the pursuit of their affairs. A threatening speech or psychological pressure may not be tolerated in a "parliament" of peers; physical interference would be ruled out strictly. That is what "parliaments" at least are for—avoiding violent overthrow of government, even though they may be crude ones quite unlike our present-day assemblies. One might compare the character of the "parliament" in Magna Carta days to the present House of Commons to get an idea of the differences in mind.

If an assembly is an institution for encouraging certain kinds of behavior (non-violent) and values of its members for the solu-

1. *Journal of Indian History*, Q. R., pp. 172ff.

2. *Journal of Indian History*, Q. R., "Interpretations of Ancient Indian History", *History and Theory*, VII, 3, 1968, pp. 328f.

tions of its member's problems imagine what a stricture such norms would be upon a person of such violent and rash nature as the Kṛṣṇa depicted in our story and in the early tradition: In incident 2.3, the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* barely conceals Kṛṣṇa's ability to seize the Syamantaka Gem from Satrājī. "...he had the power of taking it from Satrājī...." [VP, ep. 2] while the older *Matsya Purāṇa* is less timid in admitting the violent means Kṛṣṇa would have used to seize the Gem. "Kṛṣṇa was powerful to take it by force... . [MP XLV, 5]. In both cases one feels that it is Kṛṣṇa's physical prowess which makes him at once an asset to the Yādava community as well as an unpredictable force beyond their control. Indeed, this is borne out in the sequel to the accounts of Kṛṣṇa and the Yādavas, [VP V, 37, p. 479] for he succeeds in instigating the self-destruction of the Yādavas as well as taking a personal hand in their extermination. This tradition, which is rooted in the *Mahābhārata*¹ is described only in a general manner in our text and in the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*—both of which undoubtedly find such nasty accounts of Kṛṣṇa's behavior an embarrassment.

Viewed against an historical backdrop where Kṛṣṇa's violent power is a firm reality, one can understand his behavior against Śatadhanvan as in line with the character of brutal warrior-prince, what is less understandable is his behaviour in our text against Jāmbavat and Akrūra. In both of these cases restraint is exercised, though of different degrees. It is noteworthy that the older *Matsya Purāṇa* presents Kṛṣṇa as slaying Jāmbavat while the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* alludes to Kṛṣṇa's slaying of Madhu during his battle with Jāmbavat. In the older tradition represented by the *Vāyu Purāṇa* and *Mahābhārata*, Kṛṣṇa is also barely restrained from physical violence against Akrūra during the final episode of our story,² though the reasons implied in the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* and in the older tradition of the *Vāyu Purāṇa* and the *Mahābhārata* differ again.

It is our contention that, even though there are other factors which may inform the reasons for Kṛṣṇa's restraint against Akrūra in 11.32, what still emerges is the tradition of the *Vāyu Purāṇa* and

1. The *Mahābhārata* gives vivid details of this internecine slaughter amid which an account of the Syamantaka Gem Story is repeated. See the above reference to Saṃyabhāma-Jāmbavatī dichotomy.
2. Patil, D. R., pp. 172f.

the *Mahābhārata* : Kṛṣṇa's restraint is seemingly dictated by the exigencies imposed upon him by his compliance with the norms of an assembly of peers ! It is this need for the restraint of physical force, this need to comply with the rules implied in accepting membership in an assembly of peers which is an important theme in our story. Without canalizing our conclusion, we might state this politico-social theme in the following words : One does not attain one's politico-social aims in our society by using violent physical coercion. It is through diplomatic action—neither flaccid nor timid, which holds out acceptance and respect, that will win the day. It is such a meaning which agrees with our structural conclusions : Kṛṣṇa achieves his "exoneration" (and the story's goal in the eyes of the ancient commentator) by comporting himself to Akrūra over the matter of his possession of the Syamantaka Gem in a way which combines accusation, exoneration, destruction and preservation in one act. [11.22]. Kṛṣṇa begins by flattering Akrūra (preservation) : "Kinsman, you are a very prince in your liberality", counters with a bold statement of fact (accusation) "But we know that the Syamantaka Gem is in your possession" etc., follows this up with an exoneration, "So let it remain....", all of which Akrūra understands as a being "taxed" (destruction), a being prodded. Yet all this takes place in a way which balances all the factors involved, thus making it possible for Akrūra to admit his complicity in the death of Satrājī and his possession of the Syamantaka Gem—and allows Kṛṣṇa to achieve "exoneration". Thus, in its own way—by an opposition and then resolution of the myth's constituent bundled relations, by showing that some permutations of these relations fail and other succeed, the myth suggests the solution to its set problem.

Having made and supported the claim for a distinct political (social) theme in our story we should like to explore a religious theme of special interest, not unrelated to the political issues raised above. It is our conviction that the Syamantaka Gem Story marks an interesting phase in the historical and logical development of the apotheosis of Kṛṣṇa, who, as we have suggested and as experts in the field have stated, was not considered divine in the early tradition¹ but was rather depicted as, no doubt, an heroic and mighty,

1. Pusalker, A. D., ; Hopkins, E. W., *Epic Mythology*. The Encyclopaedia of Indo-Aryan Research, III, 18 Stras-

though somewhat rash, greedy and even ruthless figure: Kṛṣṇa the diplomat and healer of our story is a far cry from Kṛṣṇa whose "heart was roasted by terrific speeches"¹ against Akrūra in the *Vāyu Purāṇa* or the Kṛṣṇa who instigated and joined in the slaughter of the Yādavas later in the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* and in the *Mahābhārata*. There are also other curious lapses of divinity in our text—Kṛṣṇa is sometimes omniscient (he knows that what appears to be Sūrya coming to visit him at our story's beginning is really Satrajit wearing the Syamantaka Gem); at other times he relies upon shrewd powers of deduction (Kṛṣṇa deduces that Akrūra possesses the Syamantaka Gem because the good that prevails in Dvārakā during Akrūra's presence is an effect wholly disproportionate to the cause claimed for it—Akrūra's virtue, therefore Akrūra must possess the Syamantaka Gem); and at other times Kṛṣṇa remains as ignorant of the causes of events as any of the Yādavas (Kṛṣṇa must be told by Satyabhāmā of her father's murder by Śatadhanvan; he does not infer to Akrūra's possession of the Syamantaka Gem until three years after it has been in Akrūra's possession etc.). The phase in the development of Kṛṣṇa as divine, which we encounter in the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* Syamantaka Gem Story, is one which may very well still recall the early tradition (or at least another tradition similar to the early one) while attempting a reconciliation between that earlier tradition and the later divinization of Kṛṣṇa which we get most completely in the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*. The contradiction to which this gives rise in the mind of the devotee is, we would suggest, grappled with in our text.² The

bourg, 1915, pp. 212, 215; Edgerton, F., (trans. ed.), *The Bhagavad Gita*, Harper Torchbooks, NYC, 1964, pp. 132-5.

1. Patil, D. R., pp. 172f.
2. Wilson's note on the commentator-editor's note *The Viṣṇu Purāṇa* p. 345 to Kṛṣṇa's "reflecting" that Akrūra's virtue is a cause wholly disproportionate to the effects it is supposed to yield, which we mentioned above as an instance of "shrewd inference", reveals the embarrassment caused by the inconsistency of Kṛṣṇa's dual natures. The latter's inept attempt to obviate this open contradiction (perhaps a trivial one at that) amounts to his saying that this reflecting of Kṛṣṇa's "is to be understood of him only as consistent with the account here given of him as if he were a mere man; for as he was omniscient there was no reason for him to reflect or reason". Yet the story gives

problem of how Kṛṣṇa can be *both* man and god, of how this early tradition can be reconciled with a newer tradition and the paradox which consequently arises is tackled and solved in the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* Syamantaka Gem Story in a way which relates to the conservative political theme just discussed.

It is our contention however that the religious solution which the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* version of our story offers is that this paradox is too treacherous to attempt a positive solution—indeed the paradox is unfathomable or scandalous. Far better is it to stand by the tried and true reliance upon the efficacy of brahminic-style sacrifice than risk attachment to the fickle Kṛṣṇa. The story allows that Kṛṣṇa should be absolved of heinous crimes, yet he is not deemed worthy of possessing the Syamantaka Gem! Rather, Akrūra, though he conspired in Satrajit's death, allied himself with enemies of the Yādavas, and concealed the whereabouts of the Syamantaka Gem is granted possession of the Gem—apparently because of his continence and diligence in offering brahminic-style sacrifices!¹ (and perhaps also because of his ancestors' patronage of the brahmins!)

It is significant that the attitude of the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* is so markedly different from that of the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa*'s regarding Kṛṣṇa, Akrūra and the place of brahminic sacrifice. Kṛṣṇa is a full-blown deity even to a melodramatic extent—his honour is never seriously impugned; he is never directly accused of crimes by the people, nor does he have lapses of knowledge. Akrūra yields up the Syamantaka Gem to Kṛṣṇa at the story's end and little is made of the efficacy of Brahminic sacrifices on his behalf. This latter is pushed into second place behind love and devotion to Kṛṣṇa. The *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* prefers to ignore any serious threat to Kṛṣṇa's divinity and breaks with the reserve of our *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* text.

By this exercise in a structural analysis of the Syamantaka Gem Story we have attempted to follow a method similar to that

us several examples where Kṛṣṇa not only needs to reflect and reason but occasions in which Kṛṣṇa is completely ignorant.

1. The *Matsya* and *Vāyu Purāṇas* likewise support the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa*'s contention that Akrūra is a patron of Brahminic style of the sacrifice. *Matsya Purāṇa* "Ep" 4, Above p. 407, and Patil, D. R., p. 24.

laid down by Levi-Strauss in several places in an attempt to connect this story to some relevant political and theological themes which were also political and theological *beliefs* for some sector of the society from which the Viṣṇu Purāṇa Syamantaka Gem Story partly originated. It would be important to stress, however, how our analysis has been less ambitious than those which Levi-Strauss has undertaken in two broad respects : We have not tried to make our results cross-culturally comparative, though our analysis, we think, would provide a useful beginning for such a task. We might well have compared the Kṛṣṇa of the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* Syamantaka Gem Story to the Jesus of the New Testament. Is there not a certain similar tension within Jesus between the "pacific", "Preserving" Christ—the Jesus of non-resistance to evil, the suffering servant of Isaiah and the Christ of violence and destruction—the Jesus who drove the moneylenders from the temple, the Apocalyptic Jesus of the Book of Revelation, the Jesus of possible Zealot connections ?¹ Are there not further analogies between Jesus' compliant attitude towards the state and Kṛṣṇa's acceptance of Yādavan political norms ? If Jesus' case is understandable as a kind of spiritual irony—by his resurrection Jesus conquers and succeeds in spite of the power of the state, Kṛṣṇa's case seems slightly different. His victory is not total in the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* as it is in the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*—where Kṛṣṇa wins both an explicit exoneration and the Syamantaka Gem. It was not our purpose however to undertake such an extensive comparative project but to go some distance in pointing the way to a possible cross-culturally comparative analysis.

Moreover, although we made frequent use of other variants of the Syamantaka Gem Story within roughly the "same culture", it was not even our intention to undertake a structural analysis of the relation that story may have had to the general make-up of Indian mythology, though again it would be a minute, though useful beginning for such a project. There are reasons why the "violence versus non-violence" opposition may be a common one in Indian stories and its resolution in the same stories important for Indian societies, and moral, political or religious beliefs, etc.² Important

1. Brandon, S. G. F., *Jesus and the Zealots*, Manchester Univ. Press, Manchester, 1968.

2. Robinson, M. S., "Some Reflections...",

as this kind of investigation would be, it was not the problem our analysis set itself—though again, what we have attempted to do should be of use to those scholars seeking to pursue that distant and ambitious task of constructing a structural inventory of Indian mythology—and of those, who along with Levi-Strauss, hope to relate such structures to other structures in that society and to other societies.

[A knowledge of the following facts regarding the life of Kṛṣṇa may be useful in appreciating the article by Mr. Strenski : (1) Kṛṣṇa was 19 at the time of the performance of the Rājasūya sacrifice by Yudhiṣṭhira. (2) Kṛṣṇa married Jāmbavatī and then Satyabhāmā within the next 3 years. Rukmiṇī was his first wife. (3) The incident of the S. gem occurred 2 years after Yudhiṣṭhira's becoming heir-apparent at the age of 21. (4) Yudhiṣṭhira was older than Arjuna by 2 years who in turn was younger than Kṛṣṇa by 3 months. For a detailed discussion on these and other relevant matters, *vide* the article 'In which of the four Dvārakās' by V. P. Athavale in Poona Orientalist, XIX. 1-4. The story has been alluded to in Nirukta 2. 4.

The *tithi* on which Prasena refused to give the S. Gem to Kṛṣṇa is said to be the माद्रपदशुक्लचतुर्थी, on which day Hindus do not look at the moon since Kṛṣṇa was charged with theft on this day. In some parts of India a vow called कृष्णकलङ्किनी is observed on this day by the Vaiṣṇavas. *Vide* Hist. of Dharmaśāstra (V. p. 147) for some important information on the verse सिंहः प्रसनेमवधीत्....

—Editor]

THE VĀYUPURĀṆA AND THE MĀRKAṆḌEYAPURĀṆA : A COMPARATIVE STUDY

By

LALLANJI GOPAL

The *Purāṇas* seem to have grown beyond the narrow description of five characteristics at an early stage of their evolution. The process of the growth and development of the *Purāṇas* was helped by a desire to encompass within their fold different types of knowledge and various sciences. The accretions include, among other things, the rites, tenets and mythologies of different sects and also the ideas and principles of the different systems of philosophy. The principles of Sāṅkhya and the practices of Yoga were accommodated in some *Purāṇas*. One interesting piece of information in these sections concerns premonitory signs or *ariṣṭas*. The *ariṣṭas* are described in the *Vāyu*,¹ *Mārkaṇḍeya*² and *Līṅga*³ *Purāṇas*. The *Skanda Purāṇa*⁴ also lists indications foretelling impending death, though without employing the name *ariṣṭa*. The *ariṣṭas* are also enumerated in the *Viṣṇudharmottarapurāṇa*.⁵ Here we propose to confine our observations to the *Vāyu* and *Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇas*.⁶

A comparison of the relevant chapters in the *Mārkaṇḍeya-purāṇa* (=MP) and the *Vāyupurāṇa* (=VP) is revealing. In the MP there are forty verses on *ariṣṭas*, whereas the VP has only thirty-three verses. Verses 35, 36 and 39 of the MP, which deal with the behaviour of a person who has known his impending death through

1. Ch. 19

2. Ch. 43

3. I. 91

4. IV. 41

5. III. 238. 1-33.

6. The *Skandapurāṇa* is a late composition. The *Līṅga-purāṇa* evidently borrows its narrative on *ariṣṭas* from the *Vāyupurāṇa*—R.C. Hazra, *Studies in the Puranic Records on Hindu Rites and Customs*, p 96. Our article on '*Ariṣṭas in the Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa*' appeared in *Purāṇam*, Vol. (XXIV. 1 Jan. 1982).

*śiṣṭas*⁷, do not occur in the VP. Verse 33 of the VP is without a corresponding verse in the MP. Similar provisions in the MP are found in verses 37, 38 and 40, particularly the last one.⁸

Verses 5, 6, 13 and 34 in MP, dealing respectively with indications of death after nine months, eight months, ten days and impending death, do not have any thing parallel in the VP. Likewise, verses 24, 25, 20 (first line) and 27 (first line) of the VP mention indications of immediate death which are not to be found in the MP.

For the remaining verses we can trace parallels in the other text. The extent of correspondance is of varying nature. In the case of parallel verses, we have instances of identical lines, the difference in the form of one word can be expected to have been caused by the copyists involved. The identical lines are MP. 2 (second line) = VP. 2 (second line); MP. 9 (first line) = VP. 7 (first line); MP. 10 (first line) = VP. 8 (first line); MP. 14 (first line) = VP. 11 (first line); MP. 18 (first line) = VP. 15 (first line); MP. 29 (second line) = VP. 28 (second line) and MP. 30 (first three *pādas*) = VP. 29 (first three *pādas*).

In other cases we find the same words but their positions in the verses are changed. Sometimes we find synonyms being used. In many cases the same idea is conveyed by paraphrasing the lines. We compare below corresponding verses from the two *Purāṇas* to indicate the nature and extent of parallelism.

(1) VP 2-MP 2 changes the order of the indications, paraphrases *mahāpatham* as *devamārgam* and adds *śukram*.

(2) VP 3—It has *Araṣmivantaṁādityaṁ raṣmivantaṁca pāvakaṁ* which is paraphrased in MP 3 as *Araṣmibimbaṁ sūryasya vahniṁ caivāṁśumālinam*.

(3) VP 4—For its *daśamāsān sa jīvati* we have in MP 4 *jīvati sa daśamāsikam*.

7. In the *nibandha-granthas* the subject comes under the general heading of *utkrānti*.

8. VP, 33—Ariṣṭasūcite dehe tasmin kālā upāgate. Tyaktvā bhayaviśādaṁca udgacchedbuddhimānnaraḥ. MP.40—Jñātvā kālāṁca taṁ samyagabhayasthānamāśritaḥ. Yujjīta yogi kālō' sau yathā nāyā phalo bhavet.

(4) VP 5 is paraphrased in MP 7, which substitutes *pārṣṇyām* for *prṣṭhato*.

(5) VP 6—The order of indications is changed in MP 8 which has *vāyaso* for *kākaḥ* and adds *kākolo*. In VP the first line has the expression *nilīyed yasya mūrddhani*. MP drops *nilīyed* and instead transforms *khagaḥ kaścit* in the second line into *khagaḥ nīlaḥ* revealing its sources in the process. For *ṣaṃmāsān nātivarttate* MP has *ṣaṃmāsāyuhpradarśakāḥ*.

(6) VP 7—*Vadhyed* is replaced by *hanyate*, and *paśyet* by *drṣṭvā* in MP 9. *Chāyām vā vikṛtām* in VP is happier than *svām chāyāman-yathā* of MP.

(7) VP 8—For *paśyed* MP 10 has *drṣṭvā*. *Udakendradhanur-vāpi* is replaced by *rātrāvindrathanuścāpi* in MP. *Trayo dvau vā sa jīvati* is paraphrased as *jīvitaṃ dvitrimāsikam*. The premonitory sign of seeing a rainbow at night is mentioned more appropriately later in VP 21 (*rātrau cendrāyudham paśyed*) and MP 24 (*śakrāyudha-ñcārdharātre*), hence the reference in MP 10 is an unnecessary repetition. It occurs possibly because the compiler of the MP considered *udaka* in *udakendradhanur* to be redundant and substituted *rātrau* for *udaka*-.

(8) VP 9—MP 11 substitutes *toye* for *apsu* and adds *ghṛte taila*. For *ātmānam* in VP we find *ātmanastanum* in MP. *Ātmānam* is repeated in the second line of VP.

(9) VP 10—The first line is paraphrased in MP 12 with the significant replacement of *vasāgandhi* by *vastamaso gandho*. In the second line MP drops *mṛtyurhyupasthitas* and adds *yogino nṛpa jīvitaṃ*, making consequential changes in paraphrasing the remaining words.

(10) VP 11—The only change is in respect of the first half of the second line. It reads *adbhiḥ spṛṣṭo na hrīyēt* in VP and *hrīyate nāmbusamspṛśāt* in MP.

(11) VP 12—For *yuktena rasena* and *vidyānmṛtyurupasthitaḥ* MP 15 has *yānastho* and *na mṛtyuḥ kaṣaṃśchati*. Likewise, *āśāṃ* and *vrajat* are replaced by *dīśāṃ* and *prayāti*.

(12) VP 13—MP 16 changes *krṣṇāmbaṛadharaḥ śyāmā* into *raktakṛṣṇāmbaṛadharaḥ*, which is not appropriate. It further adds *hasatī* after *gāyanti*.

(13) VP 14—It has two indications. The first, *chidraṁ vāsaśca kṛṣṇaśca swapne yo vidhryānnaraḥ*, is dropped by MP 17. The second, *bhagnaṁ vā śravaṇam*, can easily be expected to be a mistake of the copyist, the original reading having been *nagnaṁ vā śramaṇam*. This seems to have been elaborated in MP verse as *Nagnaṁ kṣapaṇa-kaiḥ swapne hasamānaṁ mahābalaṁ. Ekaṁ saṁvīkṣyan valgantam*

(14) VP 15 is clearly paraphrased in MP 18. *Nimajjet* is replaced by *nimagnam*, *dṛṣṭvā tu tādṛśaṁ swapnam* by *swapne paśyatya-thātmānam* and *sadya eva na jīvati* by *sa sadyo mriyate naraḥ*.

(15) VP 16 has *bhasmāṅgārāṁśca keśāṁśca* which is better than *Keśāṅgārāṁstathā bhasma* in MP 19. *Śuṣkā* is replaced by *nirjalā*. The second line, *paśyedyo daśarātrāntu na sa jiveta tādṛśaḥ* is expressed differently as *dṛṣṭvā swapne daśāhāntu mṛtyurekādaśe dine*.

(16) VP 17—MP 20 adds *karālair*, changes the order of *kṛṣṇaiḥ* and *vikaṣaiḥ* and uses *tāḍitaiḥ* in place of *tāḍyate*. For *sadyo na sa jīvati* MP writes *sadyo mṛtyuṁ labhennaraḥ*.

(17) VP 18—MP 21 drops *pratyūṣasi* but adds *viparītaṁ parītaṁ vā*. The fourth *pāda*, *sa gatāyurbhavaṇnaraḥ*, appears as *sadyo mṛtyumrecheti*.

(18) VP 19—The similarity with MP 22 in expression is obvious, but, because of a few changes, the first indication has been completely changed. VP has *yasya vai snātamātrasya hṛdayaṁ pādyate bhṛṣam*, whereas MP reads *yasya vai bhuktamātrasya hṛdayaṁ bādhaḥ kṣudhā*. VP has *dantaharṣaḥ*, which refers to a morbid sensitiveness of the teeth as when they are set on edge. The compiler of MP possibly did not appreciate its meaning and substituted the commoner expression *dantagharṣaḥ* meaning chattering or grinding of teeth which, however, is not such an abnormal feature as to indicate immediate definite death. The fourth *pāda* reads *taṁ gatāyūṣamādiṣet* in VP and is worded as *sa gatāyurna saṁśayaḥ*.

(19) VP 20-21 – The indication in the first line of VP 20, *Bhūyo bhūyaḥ śvasedyastu rātrau vā yadi vā diṇi* is replaced in MP 23 by another indication, *trasyatyahni tathā nīṣi*, which is not so expressive. Further, MP 23 compresses the two indications of VP 20 into one line and adopts the second line of VP 21 as its second line. The first line of MP 24 is the same as the first line of VP

21. But MP does not mention any new indication in the spare second line which it gets. MP paraphrases *indrāyudham* as *śakrāyudham* and *nakṣatramapḍalam* as *grahagaṇam*. In place of *rātrau* MP has *ardharātre*, which, in view of the contrast with *divā*, is overdone. *Paranetreṣu cātmānaṁ na paśyet* is paraphrased by MP as *Nātmānaṁ paranetrasthaṁ vīkṣate*.

(20) VP 22.—The fourth *pāda*, *sa jñeyo gatajīvitah*, is paraphrased by MP 25 as *tasyāyurudgatam*. The position of the first and third indications is mutually changed in MP. The change of *netramekam* into *netrañca vāmam* is without any justification. Likewise, *karṇayornamanonnatī*, in place of *karṇau sthānācca bhrāṣyataḥ*, is not happier.

(21) VP 23—Of the three indications, MP 26 drops the third one, *gaṇḍe cīpiṭake rakte*, even though it is an important symptom noted in medicinal texts as well. In the case of the first, *kṛṣṇa* is replaced by *śyāma* and the significant adjective *kharā* is omitted. *Pañkabhāsañca vai mukham* has been simplified in MP as *Āraktatāmeti mukham*.

(22) VP 26—It has been paraphrased in MP 27. As in the case of VP 12, *yuktāḥ ... rathe* is replaced by *...yānena*.

(23) VP 27—MP 28 omits the introductory first line referring to the two indications as foremost *ariṣṭas*. It expands the first indication (*ghoṣaṁ na śṛṇuyāt karṇe*) to make it clear (*Pidhāya karṇau nirghoṣaṁ na śṛṇotyātmāsambhavam*). The second indication, *jyotire na paśyati*, is merely paraphrased as *naśyate cakṣuṣorjyotiryaśya*.

(24) VP 28—Its corresponding verse is MP 29 which uses *garte* for *śvabhre* and refers to its door being closed (*dvāraṁ pidhīyate*), whereas VP says that it does not have any door (*dvārañcāsya na vidyate*).

(25) VP 29—The fourth *pāda* is changed in MP 30 as *śaṁsanti puṁsāmaparam śarīram*. VP mentions two more significant indications in this part (*atyusṇamātro viśamastha eva*). The forms *sukhasya* and *śusīram* for *mukhasya* and *suśīra* of VP are due to the scribe's mistake.

(26) VP 30-31—The order of the two verses is changed in MP 31-32. VP 30 is not properly worded, whereas MP 32 has a

better expression. VP refers to the person seeing his assaulter (*taṁ paśyedatha hantāraṁ*). MP mentions them as *duṣṭairbhūtaiḥ*. MP remarks that this indication unfailingly leads to the person meeting death after seven nights. We can see that the signs indicating death are listed earlier in the chapters in a descending order of the time after which death is to occur. The context in which the present verse occurs suits more the VP reference to the assaulted person not surviving (*sa hatastu na jīvati*). VP 31 mentions the person entering fire at the end of a dream. MP 31 refers to his entering fire in a dream and not coming out of it (*na niṣkramate punaḥ*). VP mentions the person not regaining memory (*smṛtiṁ nopalabheccāpi*), but MP instead adds that it applies as well to his entering water (*jalapraveśādapi*).

(27) VP 32 is paraphrased in MP 33 but the order of the adjectives is changed. For *prāvaraṇam* in VP, we have *rastram* in MP, which adds *amalam* and replaces *kṛṣṇam* by *asitam*. In place of *tasya mṛtyurupasthitāḥ* MP uses the clause *mṛtyumāsannam tasyāpi hi vinirddiṣet*. The word *svapne* in VP, which shows that the indication relates to visions in dreams, suits the context, but is dropped by MP.

(28) VP 33—The same idea is expressed in MP 40, but the wording shows many variations.

We, thus, see that the information about the *arīṣṭas* in the two *purāṇas* is similar and in some respects identical. But, it cannot be inferred that one borrowed from the other. In that case we shall have to postulate that the author of the borrowing *Purāṇa* indulged in a labourious exercise to camouflage the borrowing by paraphrasing expressions, changing the order of lines and replacing words by their synonyms. Generally, the authors of the *Purāṇas* do not make such an effort to conceal borrowing. It would be happier to conclude that the two *Purāṇas* drew from the same common source and the differences occur genuinely when the same information is communicated by two authors in their own way. At present we do not have any text, earlier than these two *Purāṇas*, from which they could have derived information on *arīṣṭas*.

Chapter 43 of the *Mārkaṇḍeya purāṇa*, which deals with *arīṣṭas*, occurs in its second part containing chapters 10 to 44. In this part the four wise birds answer the questions of Jaimini through the

story of Jaḍa Sumati and his father, Mahāmati. Chapters 16 to 44 embos in this broader narrative the dialogue between Dattātreya and Alarka and the stories about them; they deal with the different points relating to Yoga. After narrating the stories about Dattātreya and Alarka, the text presents the practical (*pravṛtti*) side of *dharma* through the dialogue between Madālasā and Alarka (Chapters 27 to 36). The *niṣṛtti* side of *dharma* is propounded in chapters 37 to 44 wherein the threads of Yoga are resumed by Dattātreya.

The *Mārkaṇḍeya purāṇa* is recognised to be one of the oldest *Purāṇas*. Pargiter regards the original parts of this *Purāṇa* to have been in existence in the third century A. D. and the latest part to have been completed in the fifth or sixth century A. D. He places Chapters 10 to 44 between these two dates.⁹ R. C. Hazra is in general agreement with Pargiter about the date of the chapters. According to him, the story of Sumati was inserted into the *Mārkaṇḍeya purāṇa*, possibly not earlier than A. D. 200. Out of the chapters connected with the story of Sūmati, Hazra places chapters 12, 14, 15 and 28 to 35 sometime about the third or fourth century, and chapter 33 (verse 8 to the end) even later than these chapters, but before the beginning of the fifth century.¹⁰ But the question, whether the portions containing the account on Yoga in the form of a dialogue between Dattātreya and Alarka, particularly chapter 43, formed part of the story of Sumati from the beginning or it was inserted along with the first or second set of *Smṛti* chapters, has not been considered.

V. S. Agrawal, who regards the *Mārkaṇḍeya-purāṇa* to be permeated by the typical culture of the golden age of the Guptas¹¹, is of the opinion that the chapter 43 on *ariṣṭas* is a clear interpolation in the section on Yoga.¹² Thus, if the portions on Yoga are taken to have formed part of the story of the Sumati from the beginning, they are to be placed sometime after A. D. 200. If they were coeval with the *Smṛti* chapters, they are to be dated in the

9. *Mārkaṇḍeya-Purāṇa* (English translation), Introduction p. xx.

10. *Op. cit.*, pp. 8-13.

11. *Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa, aka sāmiskṛtika adhyayana*, p. 1.

12. *Ibid.*, p. 111.

third century. The chapter 43 on *ariṣṭas*, which is a distinct interpolation in the portions on Yoga, is evidently to be placed after the third century. There is nothing to indicate the date when this chapter was interpolated. But, if we regard it to be of the same date as interpolated chapter 33 (verses 8]to the end), then, following Hazra, we may place the chapter on *ariṣṭas* some time in the fourth century.

R. C. Hazra¹³ holds that chapters 10 to 20 (in which chapter 19 on *ariṣṭas* appears) in the *Vāyupurāṇa* cannot be dated earlier than A. D. 200 and were interpolated after A. D. 400. His argument is that these chapters in the *Vāyupurāṇa* were influenced by chapters 39 to 43 of the *Mārkaṇḍeya*,¹⁴ 'the Vāyu has not only a good number of verses in common with the Mārkaṇḍeya but has also improved upon the latter with fresh additions of chapters and verses.' As the *Mārkaṇḍeya* chapters 39-43 are not to be dated earlier than A. D. 200, the *Vāyupurāṇa* chapter 19 is to be dated later still. Hazra further argues that as these chapters on Pāsupata Yoga are not found in the *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa*, they did not occur in the *Vāyupurāṇa* earlier, but were interpolated after the *Vāyupurāṇa* and *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa* were separated about A. D. 400. Thus, following Hazra, the addition of Chapter 19 (along with other chapters on Pāsupata Yoga) to the *Vāyupurāṇa* is to be placed after A. D. 400.

The date and arguments suggested by Hazra have generally been adopted by subsequent scholars. S.N. Roy¹⁵ supports his conclusion by an internal scrutiny of the chapters, the Buddhist influence on them, their sectarian nature and incongruous and inconsistent plan.¹⁶

But, the main premise of Hazra's thesis, that the *Vāyupurāṇa* chapters show influence of and improvement over the *Mārkaṇḍeyapurāṇa*, cannot be substantiated. We have shown that though there are similarities, there are differences as well in expressions and details, besides verses which appear only in one of the two texts. In the present situation it is difficult to decide as to which of the

13. *Op. cit.*, p. 15.

14. *Vāyu* 19 = *Mārkaṇḍeya* 43.

15. *Historical and Cultural Studies in the Purāṇas*, pp. 198-200.

16. *Ibid.*, pp. 178-79, 192, 207-8.

two texts is the borrower. It is only an *a priori* assumption, that the *Mārkaṇḍeyapurāṇa* is earlier, which has led Hazra to infer that the *Mārkaṇḍeyapurāṇa* chapter is original and has been followed by the *Vāyupurāṇa*. If we analyse the corresponding chapters in the two *Purāṇas* with an open mind, we shall be inclined to support the claim of the *Vāyupurāṇa* to be regarded as the earlier of the two. The improvement, to which Hazra refers, is not of a nature to imply a revising hand. Actually in many cases the expression in the *Vāyupurāṇa* is brief and seems to have been paraphrased and elaborated in the *Mārkaṇḍeyapurāṇa* to make it clearer. In some cases the premonitory signs as recorded in the *Vāyupurāṇa* are nearer to the correct description of the *ariṣṭa* in other early sources, such as the *Devaladharmasūtra*. This cannot be interpreted as an improvement upon the *Mārkaṇḍeyapurāṇa*. On the contrary, it would indicate that the compiler of the *Mārkaṇḍeyapurāṇa*, later in date, could not understand the nature of some *ariṣṭas*, and substituted words and expressions, thus exposing his mistake.

We are inclined to believe that the similarities in the *ariṣṭa* chapters of the two *Purāṇas* do not necessarily imply that the one borrowed from the other. The differences cannot be explained as resulting from a deliberate desire of copyist to introduce changes or as occurring unconsciously in the process of copying. We would suggest that both the texts drew upon a common source and in the process reveal similarities and introduce elements of change and difference. These are honest differences which can be expected to occur in such a case. We cannot, in the present state of knowledge, identify any particular text as the original from which the two *Purāṇas* borrowed. Early accounts of *ariṣṭas* are found in the *Devaladharmasūtra*¹⁷ and the *Mahābhārata*¹⁸ also. It is to be noted that all these early accounts of *ariṣṭas* in the *Devaladharmasūtra*, *Mahābhārata*, *Vāyupurāṇa* and *Mārkaṇḍeyapurāṇa* occur in the context of philosophy and practice of Yoga. It is not unlikely that the two *Purāṇas* borrowed the narrative of *ariṣṭas* from the *Mahābhārata*, or more likely from the *Devaladharmasūtra*, and reshaped, sometimes by elaborating it, in their own way. Here again we cannot brush aside the possibility of a common tradition of *ariṣṭas* in the Yogic

17. Quoted in *Kṛtyakalpataru*, *Mokṣakāṇḍa*, pp. 248-50.

18. XII. 305.

circle from which the four texts alike drew their accounts. If the *Mahābhārata* or the *Devadadharmasūtra* is not taken to represent the original or earliest recorded version, we would suggest that the earlier Yogic tradition about *ariṣṭas* was handed down orally, which may explain the variations in the accounts in the different texts. Here we will not go back still further to discuss the possible origin of the Yogic tradition of *ariṣṭas*.¹⁹

In view of its nearness to the *Devadadharmasūtra* in its structure and the details of the premonitory signs and the references to Yoga in its passage,²⁰ the chapter on *ariṣṭas* in the *Vāyupurāṇa* is to be regarded as representing a stage earlier than that found in the corresponding chapter in the *Mārkaṇḍeyapurāṇa*.

Another argument of Hazra for placing the *ariṣṭa* chapter of the *Vāyupurāṇa* later than the corresponding chapter in the *Mārkaṇḍeyapurāṇa* is based on the fact that the *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa* does not have a chapter on *ariṣṭas*. This is taken to indicate that the chapter in the *Vāyupurāṇa* was inserted after the *Vāyupurāṇa* and *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa* separated from one common text. The thesis, that the two *Purāṇas* were originally one and became separate later, was put forth by Pargiter.²¹ Hazra, supporting it, attributed it to sectarian causes and placed it after A. D. 400.²² We agree with

19. Our article on 'Ariṣṭas in Yoga' is to appear elsewhere.

20. We discuss it separately in our article on 'Ariṣṭas in the *Devadadharmasūtra*'.

21. *Ancient Indian Historical Tradition*, pp. 23, 77.

22. *Op. cit.*, p. 18. S.N. Roy, *op. cit.*, though referring to Hazra's views with approval (p. 21), suggests improvements. We may agree with his conclusion that the 'process of the compilation extended over a number of centuries and *Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa* assumed its extant shape after incorporating the portion depicting Jāmadagnya-Rama's legend sometime about 1000 A.D.' (p. 192). We find it difficult to agree with his view that 'possibly the text was one even till the 7th Century A.D., because the author of *Harṣacarita* does not give any specific name to the *Purāṇa* proclaimed by Pavamāna whose reading he attended in his village.' (208). In the writings of Bāṇa we have actually two passages which are relevant to our present discussion. In the *Kādambarī* (*Pūrvabhāga*, para 37-*purāṇe vāyupralapitam*) it is stated through a *śloka* that there was no babbling in the hermitage of sage Jābali;

the general contention that the two *purāṇas* started with a common nucleus or drew upon a common source for much of their material. But, the inference, that, whatever occurs in only one of the two *Purāṇas*, must necessarily belong to a date after the separation of the two, is not a valid corollary. The criterion is not to be applied mechanically in all the cases. The Puranic texts present a queer phenomenon. The compilation of the text and the subsequent history of its elaboration or change are not governed by set and fixed rules. At many places we find passages and chapters being interpolated in the text. But we also find parallel cases of passages being changed, or sometimes, completely dropped.²³ We cannot determine the reasons operating behind all these changes and deve-

there was proclaiming by Vāyu in the *Purāṇa*. The other reference to which S. N. Roy alludes occurs in the *Harṣacarita* (III, para 4-5 : *Pustakavācakaḥ Sudṛṣṭiḥ .gītyā pavamānaproktam papāṭha. Tadapi Munigītamatiprṛthū tadapi jagadvyāpi pāvanam tadapi Harṣacaritādabhinnaḥ pratibhāti hi me Purāṇamidam*). It says that 'the book-reader Sudṛṣṭi treated Bāṇa and his relatives and friends to a musical recitation of the *Purāṇa* promulgated by Vāyu, that was sung by the sage (Vyāsa, that is very extensive, that is world-wide (i. e. known everywhere), that is holy and that is not different from the career of Harṣa' The literary usage of Sanskrit language and the style of Bāṇa leave no doubt about the passages employing the words *vāyupralapitam*, *pavamānaproktam* and *pāvanam* actually referring to the *Vāyupurāṇa*. See also Kane, *History of Dharmaśāstra*, V, p. 822. The further remark of S. N. Roy that 'it is hardly conceivable that an author of Bāṇa's calibre should write on irrelevant and ambiguous line' (p. 210) goes against his conclusion. If we follow Roy's line of argument, we shall have to assume that, though there was one *Vāyupurāṇa*, Bāṇa knew that in future there will be two *Purāṇas* issuing out of it, both claiming to have been proclaimed by Vāyu. If it is suggested that Bāṇa wanted to cover both *Vāyu* and *Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇas* by his description, then we reach the conclusion that the two *Purāṇas* had come to acquire separate forms. It is to be noted that after the compilation of the two *Purāṇas* as separate texts the references in Bāṇa's writings will imply the *Vāyupurāṇa* and not the *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa*.

23. This is abundantly clear from the large number of passages and chapters which are quoted in the medieval commentaries and digests but appear in the available texts in vastly altered form or do not occur at all.

lopments. They could have been caused by the mistake of the copyist or else deliberately omitted or altered by subsequent compilers on sectarian grounds or on account of an honest inability to see the justification for their presence in the text. S. N. Roy,²⁴ in referring to the absence of chapters 11 to 20 of the *Vāyupurāṇa* in the *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa*, remarks that it 'does not necessarily meant that they were absent also in the original and ancestral source of these two Purāṇas. For, loss of original passages in the extant Purāṇas are as common as addition of later passages and alteration of early ones.' But this remains a casual observation and S. N. Roy has not cared to work out its implications. Following this remark it can be suggested that the chapters in question possibly occurred in the original or common *Vāyupurāṇa*, but, whereas the compiler of the *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa* chose to drop them, they were retained in the *Vāyupurāṇa*.

With due hesitation, I must submit that I am not much enamoured of the idea of the two *Purāṇas* separating from one common *Purāṇa*. In ancient times there was a definite tradition, recorded even in some of the early *Purāṇas*,²⁵ listing the names of the eighteen *Purāṇas*. The *svargārohaṇaparva* of the *Mahābhārata*²⁶ and the *Harivamśa*²⁷ refer to the eighteen *Purāṇas* without naming them. R. C. Hazra, who has argued to show that all these passages in the *Purāṇas*, *Mahābhārata* and *Harivamśa* were either revised or interpolated in later times, dates the canon of the eighteen *Mahāpurāṇas* not earlier than the third but not later than the first quarter of the seventh century AD.²⁸ We must adequately emphasise the point that a considerable gap is to be postulated between the formulation and general acceptance of the list of the *Purāṇas* and the composition, circulation and due recognition of these *Purāṇas* individually. The composition of all the *Purāṇas* does not belong to the same period; the earliest among them possibly

24. *Op. cit.*, p. 198.

25. *Viṣṇu* III. 6.21-23; *Mārkaṇḍeya* 134.7-11; *Vāyu* 104.2-10; *Matsya* 53.11-19; *Varāha* 112.69-72.

26. 5.45-46; 6.97.

27. III. 135.3.

28. *Op. cit.*, pp. 2-4, Kane, *Op. cit.*, V, p. 831 is more cautious in his remark that 'the list of 18 principal Purāṇas had been completed long before 1000 A. D. and was introduced in the *Viṣṇupurāṇa* many years before that.'

went back to very early times. As has been rightly pointed out by P. V. Kane,²⁹ the reference to *Purāṇas* in the plural number in the *Taittirīya Āraṇyaka*³⁰ implies the circulation of at least three *Purāṇas* in those times. The *Āpastamba-dharmasūtra* clearly implies the existence of individual *Purāṇa* texts. It twice quotes two verses each from a *Purāṇa*,³¹ gives the summary of a passage from a *Purāṇa*³² and names a *Purāṇa* as *Bhaviṣyatpurāṇa*,³³ It can be surmised that the *Vāyupurāṇa* and *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa* possibly existed as separate texts quite sometime before the formulation of the list of eighteen *Purāṇas*. The suggestion that the same text by the addition of two different types of material came to be designated as two separate texts does not seem to be very plausible. It is more likely that before distinct texts came into being there was a mass of floating literature circulating under the general name of *Purāṇas*, but without being labelled or identified by the name of any particular *Purāṇa*.³⁴ It seems that in the initial stage the compilers of individual *Purāṇas* freely drew upon this fund. This is the reason why we find common passages and chapters not only in *Vāyu* and *Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇas* but also among some other *Purāṇas*.³⁵ Thus, it cannot be said, merely on the basis of the absence of the chapter on *ariṣṭas* in the *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa* that the *Vāyupurāṇa* borrowed its chapter from the *Mārkaṇḍeyapurāṇa*.

There are reasons to believe that the *Vāyupurāṇa* contains much that is of a very early period. Scholars generally agree in describing the *Vāyupurāṇa* as the oldest of the extant *Purāṇas*.³⁶

29. *Op. cit.*, V, p. 853.

30. II. 10.

31. I. 6.19.13; II. 9.23.3-6

32. I. 10.29.7

33. II. 9.24.6.

34. Some *Purāṇas* record a tradition that originally there was only one *Purāṇa* from which all the *Purāṇas* have evolved. See B. Upadhyaya, *Purāṇa-vimarsa*, p. 70. The *Purāṇa* as a separate branch of literature is attested to by the *Atharvaveda* XI. 7.24; XV. 6.10-11 and the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* XI. 5.6.8. See Kane, *op. cit.*, pp. 816-18; S. N. Roy, *op. cit.*, pp. 15-17, 31-33, 46-49.

35. Kane, *op. cit.*, V, p. 841, f.n. 1372.

36. R. C. Hazra, *op. cit.*, p. 13; R. G. Bhandarkar, *Vaiṣṇavism, Śaivism and Minor Religious Systems*; P. V. Kane, *op. cit.*, V, p. 106.

R. G. Bhandarkar placed it earlier than the *Matsyapurāṇa*³⁷ and Pargiter regarded it to be older than the *Viṣṇupurāṇa*.³⁸ Scholars date the latest portions of this *Purāṇa* not later than A.D. 500,³⁹ but generally agree that there was an ancient *Purāṇa* under the name of *Vāyu* and that the present text preserves much of the ancient work.⁴⁰ V.R.R. Dikshitar takes the earliest portion of the *Purāṇa* to the fifth century B.C.⁴¹ D.R. Patil assigns the material in the *Vāyupurāṇa* to three broad categories :⁴² the archaic survivals of which 500 B.C. is the lowest time-limit, the ancient material with the beginning of the Christian era as its lowest chronological terminus, and the accretions which do not generally go beyond A.D. 500.

The *Vāyupurāṇa* is the only *Purāṇa* which has actually been named in some early texts. The *Vanaparva* of the *Mahābhārata* mentions the *Purāṇa* proclaimed by Vāyu (*Vāyuproktam*) and refers to its two features which may be correlated with two of the five characteristics of a *Purāṇa*.⁴³ The clear admission on the part of the compiler of the *Mahābhārata* to have drawn upon the *Vāyupurāṇa* is an undoubted proof of the existence of a *Vāyupurāṇa* before the *Mahābhārata* took its present form. V.S. Sukthankar refers to the verbal similarity between a few stanzas in the *Vāyu* and some stanzas of the *Vanaparva*. But nothing corresponding to the general contents of the

37. *Early History of the Dekkan*, p. 162.

38. *Purāṇa Text of the Dynasties of the Kali Age*, p. 14, f. n. 4.

39. V. R. R. Dikshitar, *Some Aspects of the Vāyu Purāṇa*, pp. 46ff; D. R. Patil, *Cultural History from the Vāyu Purāṇa*, pp. 16.

40. See also Winternitz, *History of Indian Literature*, Vol. I, p. 554. C. V. Vaidya, *JBRAS*, 1925, pp. 155ff.

41. It is in the eighth century but does not receive approval for his arguments. Chapter 104 mentioning the Tantras and the Śākta philosophy and chapters 105-112 on Gayāmāhatmya seem to be later additions.

42. R. C. Hazra, *op. cit.*, pp. 13, 17, f. n. 9.

43. Winternitz, *loc. cit.*

op. cit.

(critical edition) III. 189.14-

... te sarvāmākhyaṭamaitānāgātāṃ tathā/
... vāyuproktamanusmṛitya purāṇamṛṣisamstutam||

passage where it occurs is to be found in the extant *Vāyu Purāṇa*.⁴⁴ Thus evidence for equating the extant *Vāyu Purāṇa* with the *Vāyu* quoted in the *Mahābhārata* is lacking. But, as correctly pointed out by D R. Patil,⁴⁵ the extant *Vāyu* 'shows at places a material definitely older than that of the Mbh' and seems to have preserved some material which originally belonged to the *Vāyupurāṇa* known to the *Mahābhārata*.

Thus, we may conclude that the *Vāyupurāṇa* is not to be dated on the assumption that its chapter on *ariṣṭas* is influenced by the one chapter in the *Mārkaṇḍeya-purāṇa*. Possibly both drew on an earlier common source. The date of the two *Purāṇas* is to be determined independently. There is evidence to indicate that the extant *Vāyupurāṇa* contains much early material which need not be dated after the corresponding chapter in the *Mārkaṇḍeyapurāṇa*. It was possibly written a little earlier. We may best summarize the position by saying that the chapters on *ariṣṭas* in the two *Purāṇas* roughly belong to the same period and the difference in their dates is not a wide one.

44. Sukthankar Memorial Edition (1944), Introduction to the *Āraṇyaka parvan*, I. 156. See also Hopkins, *The Great Epic of India*, pp. 48ff.

45. *Op. cit.*, p. 4

THE COLOPHONS IN THE CRITICALLY EDITED PURĀṆA-S*

By
GIORGIO BONAZZOLI

Colophon—or 'finishing touch' as conveyed by the etymon of the word—is to be understood, for the purpose of this article, as that part of an *adhyāya* after the last *śloka* and distinct from it, used mostly to specify the content of an *adhyāya* and its position in the regular succession of topics of a purāṇa. A puranic colophon starts usually with the word 'iti' and is formed of several parts as described in the following example taken from Varāha purāṇa (Veñk.), 29 :

1 2 3 4
इति/श्रीवराहपुराणे/आदिकृतवृत्तान्ते महातप उपाख्याने/दिगुत्पत्तिर्नाम/
5
एकोनविंशोऽध्यायः ॥२९॥

After the introduction (No 1), the colophon presents the purāṇa, sometimes with praising words, (No 2), and then the section, or general topic pertaining to a few *adhyāya*-s (No 3). The name of the *adhyāya* (No 4) and its number, both in letters and in figures or either of the two (No 5) are also given at the end.

* The purāṇa-s studied here are the following three :
Kūrma Purāṇa, critically edited by A. S. Gupta, All-India Kashiraj Trust, Vārāṇasī, 1971; Varāha Purāṇa, critically edited by A. S. Gupta, All-India Kashiraj Trust, Vārāṇasī, 1981; Vāmana Purāṇa, critically edited by A. S. Gupta, All-India Kashiraj Trust, Vārāṇasī, 1967.

The manuscripts quoted in this article are those used in the above quoted editions and presented in the introduction to the single purāṇa-s.

Abbreviations : *adh.* (s) = *adhyāya* (s)

Crit. = Critical Edition

MS (MSS) = manuscript(s)

SMā = Saromāhātmya of Vāmana Purāṇa

N. = Not given in the colophons

— = the colophon is not reproduced by the Critical Edition

Veñk. = Veṅkaṭeśvara edition

Note : The names of the Sanskrit sections or stories are usually put in the stem-form because in the colophons sometimes they appear in the locative and sometimes in the nominative.

The critical edition of the purāṇa-s and of the epics as well published upto now, give no critical text of colophons. Their editors, rather, are satisfied with 'new' colophons, i. e., not critically derived from the MSS evidence but directly composed by the editor himself on the basis of MSS material. It is true, the critical apparatus usually gives the situation of the colophons in the MSS but that also at times rather incompletely as is the case with Ādiparvan where at the end of *adhyāya* 14 it is remarked 'hereafter to the end of the Ādip., only significant constituent elements of the colophons will be noted'. This position is apparently logical considering the fact that no critical colophons can be reasonably constituted on the basis of MSS evidence. The difference between one MS and the other is such that no serious and scientific conclusion can be deduced from them. The numbers, in some cases, seem to have been rendered quite haphazardly. A few examples will suffice to illustrate this point.

MS ३ of Kūrma has the succession 35, 28, 37 (= Crit. II. 36-38)

MS ३ of Varāha has 105, 96, 97, 96, 99 (= Crit. 104-108)

MS ३ of Vāmana has 64, 30 (= Crit. 38-39)

MS ३ of Vāmana has 75, 87 (= Crit. 44-45)

It is also evident that in a few instances the copyists committed mistakes :

MSS ३, ३, ३ of Kūrma have 28, 19, 30 (= Crit. II. 28-30) where 19 is एकोनविंश instead of एकोनत्रिंश

MS ३ of Varāha has 125, 226,—, 128, 29 (= Crit. 124-128)

MS ३ of Varāha has 205, 106, 207 (= Crit. 187-189)

MS ३ of Vāmana has 24, 52, 26 (= Crit. SMā 3-5), where 52 stands surely for 25.

Such a process is so common that it has removed redibility from the colophons. However, if we consider that part of the colophons which describes the contents of the *adhyāya* we get a better picture. It seems that for this part the copyists were more attentive. In fact, although here also the difference between one MS and the other is very often so great that

any critical edition is impossible, we can get at least an idea as to whether the topic dealt with in the *adhyāya*-s was the same or different. So in this regard at least, the colophons can offer bits of information.

In preparing the critical edition of a purāṇa the MSS are grouped according to their similarity of readings. The colophons, however, cannot be classified in the same way as their respective *adhyāya*-s. That does not mean that colophons cannot be grouped following similarities of variants, they have also their own alliances. But the grouping of MSS based on similarity of colophons does not match with the groupings based on the variants of text.

What has been said explains why colophons are not normally taken into consideration by scholars. However, a little patience and attention will reveal a few strange and unexpected facts which deserve deeper study. The research is possible only for the critically edited purāṇa-s because it is through the collation of several MSS that a few facts can be noticed and some conclusions drawn. A general conclusion is that in several cases the only possible way to explain a few facts in colophons is to suppose that they are older than the text to which they are attached. In more than one instance they testify to a stage of puranic development different from the present, and so they may help considerably in reconstructing a history of the puranic text.

The following study will consider separately the problem of numbers in colophons and the problem of words. The two series of problems have to be taken separately because they are rather different even if, as we shall see, they reveal basically the same facts.

1. THE PROBLEM OF NUMBERS IN COLOPHONS

Colophons certainly contain many mistakes in their numbering and such mistakes are mostly due to carelessness of copyists. In some cases the only explanation possible, when it does not appear to be a copying mistake, is that the numbers are rendered haphazardly. We have already seen a few examples above. We could

multiply them to a very large extent. But we cannot dismiss all the evidence with these explanations only. Below we shall consider examples available from the Kūrma, Varāha and Vāmaṇa purāṇa-s which are not satisfactorily explained by the above arguments. The reason for choosing these purāṇa-s to which we alluded above and not others is that these are the only examples of which we have a critical edition based on a sufficient number of MSS from which we may draw some conclusions.

a. The new numbering

The phrase 'new numbering' is here understood to be the process through which a previous series of numbers is interrupted and a new one is started afresh beginning from one.

The Kūrma purāṇa, being divided into two parts—*Pūrvabhāga* and *Uparivibhāga*—has, naturally, a new numbering' from the beginning of the second part. Such a new numbering is given in all the MSS except ७₁ and is combined with another numbering in ३₂. The latter MS has a double numbering, one continuing from the first part, the other starting afresh from *adhyāya* one of *Uparivibhāga*. This double numbering continues for only nine *adhyāya*-s (= Crit. II. 1-10). Later the old numbering is dropped, but it is unexpectedly resumed just in the last *adhyāya* (= Crit. II.44), where the MS has No 93, instead of 44, as it would if it had continued the numbering from the beginning of the purāṇa. How such a number could be attached to this *adhyāya*, without any logical correlation to the adjacent numbers, will become clear below.

So much for the Kūrma purāṇa. The Varāha and Vāmaṇa purāṇa-s present a more complex situation and deserve greater attention. Both the purāṇa-s have in one or another of the MSS new numberings at the beginning of any important topic. The clearest example is the Mathurā māhātmya of Varāha purāṇa. Such a *māhātmya* extends in the Critical Edition from *adh.* 150 to *adh.* 178 and has a new numbering in ३₃ and ३₄. This new numbering is almost complete in ३₃ where it goes from 1 to 28 with only some irregularities and is only partial in ३₄ where it has only *adh.* 11-26 (= Crit. 160-174), here also with some irregularities. Although this new numbering does not appear in other MSS yet it seems that its influence was rather widespread. MS ३₁, for instance,

has a few numbers which belong to the new numbering, namely No 11 (= Crit. 161), No 16 (= Crit. 166), No 20 (= Crit. 169), No 27 (= Crit. 177). The peculiarities of these numbers in वृ१ is that they appear exactly where the MS वृ३ does not have numbers because of the irregularities mentioned above. Besides वृ१ six more MSS were partially influenced by the new numbering, namely दे१-४.१०, ते१. All these MSS have only *adh.* 2 (= Crit. 151) belonging to the new numbering. Five of them do not have any other numbers at all in the other colophons. One, instead, i. e., ते१ has remnants of another numbering, namely No 167 (= Crit. 150), No 183 (= Crit. 164), No 189-194 (= Crit. 169-176). So, it seems that the new numbering of the Mathurā mātmya, which is now present only in वृ३, and partially in दे१, was so much spread as to include MSS of different groups. What we have now in our MSS evidence are only fragments. ते१ reveals the existence of a particular kind of influence where the old and the new numbering mix together. This problem of double numbering will be discussed in greater detail as we proceed.

Another example of new numbering is in Varāha 191 ff (Crit.). The topic of these *adhyāya*-s is described in the colophons either as संसारचक्र or as नाचिकेतोपाख्यान, and it extends from Crit. 191 to Crit. 210 at least. It has new numbering in दे१ counting from 3 to 17 (Crit. 193-207), while in other MSS (दे१-४.८-११, वृ१) it appears only in one, two or three *adhyāya*-s. Here, then, the same situation as in the previous example is repeated; hence the influence of this new numbering appears to have been rather widely spread, and what we see today is only a remnant. This case, however, presents two peculiarities which deserve attention. The first is represented by दे१ which has the following sequence :

97, 3, 4, —, 101, 102 (= Crit. 192-197).

Nos 3-4 belong to the new numbering but their insertion in the counting does not alter the old numbering which is resumed from No 101 as if the preceding Nos were 98, 99, 100 and not Nos 3, 4, —, as in fact they are. This is neither carelessness nor haphazardly random. It may mean, rather, that the MS from which दे१ was copied already had the new numbering but in the process of copying either the exemplar MS was substituted with another or

the copyist thought it better to resume the MS's (दे४) proper numbering. This change can hardly be attributed to the whim of the copyist. The reasonable supposition is an external influence, perhaps due to another MS, and this appears more convincing when we collate the change of numbers in these *adhyāya*-s with the other MSS which also have the new numbering in exactly this place. The parallelism with the other MSS is significant because they do not have a numbering of their own, old or new, in any of the other *adhyāya*-s except in three or four. The numbers of these three or four *adhyāya*-s must have been taken from other MSS. Hence both for these three or four *adhyāya*-s and for the above mentioned MS we are considering here, we have to suppose an external influence.

The second peculiarity of this new numbering is represented by ब१ which has accepted only No 2 (= Crit. 192) of the new numbering. In fact, we do not know whether it had accepted also other numbers because the other colophons do not have any numbers. But the strange fact is that in this MS, as in the other two Bengali, ब२-३, the purāṇa ends a few *adhyāya*-s later (= Crit. 200). These Bengali MSS conclude the purāṇa with the word वराहसप्तम्. So it appears illogical that ब१ accepted in its numbering figures belonging to a topic which continues for many more *adhyāya*-s and then it suddenly interrupted it. The logical explanation is that the topic either was shortened by ब१ or lengthened by दे७ and the others. In both cases it appears strange that ब१ accepted the new numbering without accepting the full text. No 2, and perhaps also Nos 3, 4 and 5 of the MSS, make us suspect that most probably a separate unit was formed by and of themselves and as a separate unit they entered also ब१. We have to suppose that this *adhyāya* had already entered in the body of the puranic text before it was accepted in the recension represented by ब१, i.e., that it was antecedent to it. In this case, then, the colophon would reveal the situation of this MS prior to the present copy of it.

We may also look at the problem from another point of view. Let us suppose for a moment that our *adhyāya* No. 2 of ब१ (= Crit. 192) had another number, supposedly the serial one in the purāṇa. Let us also suppose that in another MS some *adhyāya*-s dealing with

Nāciketa were combined with other *adhyāya*-s to form a new booklet which now extended upto Crit. 210, and was given a new numbering independently of the general ones belonging to the purāṇa, and that not improbably such a new booklet began to have an independent life. All these suppositions are not completely imaginary if we consider that all the MSS, except वे_1 and वे_3 were affected by this new numbering and that the Bengali MSS end the purāṇa just at the middle of such a new context. In our hypothesis वे_1 as well as वे_2 -3 would be faithful to the original purāṇa and end their text at Crit. 200 and would not insert the new booklet. Even in this case, however, which supposedly puts the new booklet संसारचक्र after the Varāha purāṇa as a later development, we have to suppose that the actual *adhyāya* No 2 of वे_1 was copied from a MS which had the new numbering but not the whole 'new booklet'. In this case also, then, this *adhyāya* was perhaps present somewhere in the purāṇa before its final placement in the text of वे_1 .

Another instance of new numbering in the Varāha purāṇa is again in वे_1 -2 where a new counting begins in Crit. 112, exactly where both the text itself, and the observations of scholars, make us think that a new section of the purāṇa was started. As this has been discussed by other scholars we leave it.¹

Other examples of new numbering at the beginning of new sections are available also in the Vāmana purāṇa, for instance, at the beginning of the Saromāhātmya (see $\text{दे}_{4,7}$), or immediately after it (see वे_2 , वे_1), and in other cases which will be mentioned below. The Vāmana purāṇa presents some curious cases of new numbering where no one would expect them, as they are in *adhyāya*-s which at present do not start any new topic at all. So वे_1 -2 and वे_3 begin with No 1 in Crit. 9, which is apparently not the beginning of any new topic. दे_7 has No 1 in SMā 23, Crit., i. e., in the middle of a quite compact group of *adhyāya*-s dealing with Saromāhātmya. वे_1 have a new beginning in Crit. 47, and दे_7 has a new beginning starting from Crit. 35. In all these cases there are no reasons for a new numbering to begin. Are, then, all these new numberings completely illogical, i. e., fruit of the whim of careless copyists or do they respond to an original text which did not have access to the original MSS

¹ Hazra, *Puranic Records on Hindu Rites and Customs*, pp. 98-99; etc.

and the history of the MSS is also not well known, so the research ends up somewhat aborted; so much so if we think we are dealing with only a few MSS, out of the many dozens still available; here, we can give only a few suggestions that are hopefully reasonable and convincing.

For the first instance, i. e., the new numbering starting from Crit. 9 in ब१-३ and दे४, we notice surely that the topic is rather new as it deals with Andhaka who had not appeared until that *adhyāya*. But it seems rather improbable that this is really a new topic significant enough to deserve a new numbering, especially when we consider that a new numbering might even indicate an independent existence of that group of *adhyāya*-s. One would rather expect a new numbering a few *adhyāya*-s before, after Crit. 5 which concludes the topic of Haralalita. But Crit. 9 does not have any of those words which are available usually at the beginning of a new matter and the previous *adhyāya* does not contain any hint either that the previous topic is over. The colophons, however, can help us to find a division in the purāṇa which at first appears irrelevant but which must have had more significance in another stage in the development of the text. Winternitz² states that the Vāmana 'begins with an account of the incarnation of Viṣṇu as a dwarf (Vāmana), whence it takes its name. However, this is not true for any of the MSS collated for the critical edition. The only clue that 'the account of the Viṣṇu incarnation as dwarf' might have been in the purāṇa are the colophons which, irregularly, have वामनप्रादुर्भाव from *adhyāya* 1 to 8 of the Critical Edition. Now, these same colophons start a new topic called भैरवप्रादुर्भाव from *adhyāya* 9 of the Critical. As the first 8 *adhyāya*-s do not contain any longer the account of Vāmana *avatāra*, so also the next ones do not contain the new topic supposed to start from *adh.* 9 (Crit.). Yet the colophons are faithful, and report what must have been present in these *adhyāya*-s in previous times. They refer to a stage of the purāṇa different from, or previous to, the present one. For our purpose it is enough to show that a few colophons, both with their description and with their numbers, remained linked to that previous stage, although the text of the *adhyāya* had, at least partially, changed or had been

2. M. Winternitz, *A History of Indian Literature*, Vol. I, Part II, University of Calcutta, 1963 (II ed.), p. 502.

put into new context. So, in this case also, the colophons appear to be more conservative than the text itself. The topics of the actual Vāmana purāṇa follow the sequence given in Nārada I. 101, so the present structure of Vāmana's colophons goes back to a period previous to that of Nārada I.92-109. If the mentioned colophons refer to a previous stage of Vāmana as we have suggested, then we have here a new glimpse into the history of a puranic text.

We could also visualize the problem from another point of view and suppose that the *adhyāya*-s were already present in the previous stage of the purāṇa and that the numbering is later and was added when these *adhyāya*-s were used, say, for a specific purpose and became a unit unto themselves. In this supposition the new numbering would indicate new use only. Hence it would be extremely difficult to understand why the new numbering took place just from this very *adhyāya* as the present text does not offer any real support for the beginning of a new topic at this point. We should suppose that the reason is the one given in the colophons themselves, namely that from this point the भैरवप्रादुर्भाव started. As at present there is no भैरवप्रादुर्भाव available in the text, nor does the Nārada purāṇa's summary of Vāmana refer to it, we must again suppose that these colophons refer to some matter that was once present in the purāṇa but has now disappeared. There seems to be no other reasonable conclusion, except to suppose that the colophons refer to a previous topic, i. e., from a previous time, or to a different topic other than the one contained in the present text.

Another case of such a numbering starting where apparently there is no beginning of a new topic is represented by अ१-२ and तै१ in Vāmana 47 (Crit). Crit. 46 concludes the previous topic, although Crit. 45-46 seem to be an addition to Crit. 44 which is the real conclusion of the previous topic. In Crit. 44 in fact, even the colophons conclude by saying भैरवप्रादुर्भावं समाप्तम्. On the other hand almost all the colophons of Crit 47 have वामनप्रादुर्भाव which can be really considered the general topic of this section. This section might have also been used separately, and so some MSS, namely अ१-२ and तै१, used a new numbering. In this case we need not suppose that the colophons are older than the text. But just in this group of *adhyāya*-s starting from Crit. 47 and bearing a new numbering in अ१-२ and तै१, there is an *adhyāya*, Crit. 53, the col-

ophons of which in 6 MSS have the word समाप्तम्, although it is not clear as to what topic such a word refers. Now this word is available both in अ₁₋₁ which have the new numbering, and in शा₁, का₁₋₂ which continue with the previous numbering. So this word, completely outside predictable logic, on the one hand equates the new numbering to the old numbering by this evidence proving that the new numbering does not really refer to a new text. On the other hand it must refer to something different from the actual text. So the topic to which the word समाप्तम् refers, not being the one available in the present text, cannot be anything else than a topic which was available in this text previously but that has now disappeared. So once again some colophons prove to be more conservative than the text itself of the *adhyāya*.

The other two cases of new numbering in odd places can be dismissed in few words by saying that no specific reason could be found for it. Possibly for Vāmana, SMā 23 (Crit.), which has No 1 in दे₇, we can see that a new dialogue between Sanatkumāra and the Brāhmaṇa-s begin in just this *adhyāya*. But the clues are indeed rather scarce.

From the discussion so far, it does not seem hazardous to affirm that not infrequently some colophons take us back to a stage of puranic development that preceeds the present one. And that should be sufficient evidence to induce more scholarly attention to the colophons.

b. Double Numbering

For 'double numbering' it is understood here to be the instance in which one *adhyāya* has two different numbers in the same colophon. Double numbering is rare. We have seen one case already in Kūrma II. 1-10, where at the beginning the *Uparivibhāga* अ₁ has both the numbers 1, 2 etc. and 51, 52 etc., continuing the numbering of the *Pūrvabhāga*. Another case in the Kūrma is available in Crit. I.43-45 where दे₁ has both 43,44,45 and 46,47,48. The MS continues then with No 49 following the second numbering. The numbers 43, 44, 45 represent the regular sequence of numbers in this MS from the previous counting, while 46, 47, 48 are superimposed, but they are also continued in the subsequent counting. The two series of numbers behave as if the latter had 'slipped' over the former. The first series appears like the tail of a previous num-

bering and the second like the head of the new numbering. The former appears once again in one *adhyāya* (see Crit. 48) and then disappears again. So for all intrinsic purposes the second numbering has superseded the first one.

Kūrma II. 16-17 (Crit.) is represented in कृ१ with 5/16 and 16/17. If we consider 5 as a mistake in place of 15, then we have the succession : 14, 15/16, 16/17, 17 (= Crit. 15-18.)

A double numbering is again visible in Kūrma II. 29 and 31 (Crit.). Crit. 28-32 is represented in कृ१ in the following way :

27, 28/29, 29, 30/31, 31

This case is quite similar to the previous one.

Kūrma II. 36-44 (Crit.) are represented in कृ१ in the following manner.

37, 39/44, 40, 41, 42/37, 43/37, 44/38, 45/36, 46
In this series there are two other MSS which also give a double number, namely कृ३ which has 40/44 (= Crit. II. 38) and कृ१ which has 42/43 (= Crit. II. 43).

In the Varāha purāṇa there is only one instance of double numbering in Crit. 128-129. The succession in वृ१ starting from Crit. 127 upto Crit. 130 is the following :

16, 17/123, 18/124, 125

The MS वृ१ had started a new numbering from Crit. 112 along with MSS वृ२ and वृ३. In all three MSS this new series seems to end with No 18 and the comparison with वृ१० (cf. Crit. 125-129) seems to confirm it, although some random numbers both in वृ२ (cf. Crit. 139, 141) and in वृ३ (cf. Crit. 137) would support the opposite. It is exactly at the point of ending this new numbering that the second series is inserted and then continued in the following *adhyāya*-s. We have here the same 'slipping' process as in the case stated above regarding Kūrma I. 43-45 (Crit.).

Finally in the Vāmana purāṇa we have two cases of double numbering in Crit. 39 and Crit. 56. In the first instance, Crit. 37-40 are presented in वृ११ by the following sequence ;

59, N, 30/61, 61

No 30, which is here completely out of place, is available also at this point in MSS दे₁₋₃₋₄. No 30 is in its regular succession only in दे₄, while it is out of series in the other two. From the MSS evidence, then, this colophon was copied from दे₄ where the number is in its logic sequence and hence inserted into the other MSS. In दे₁ and दे₃ it produced a change in the numbering, so that Crit. 37-40 represent them in the following way :

दे₁ 63, 64, 30, 31

दे₃ N, 63, 30, 31

In दे₁₁ on the contrary a double number appears in one *adhyāya*.

The second case of a double numbering in the Vāmana is in Crit. 56 Here तै₁ has No 10 and No 42. The colophon situation of तै₁ at this point is rather chaotic. Crit. 54-57 is represented in तै₁ thus :

6, N., 10/42, 73

Nos 6 and 10 belong to the numbering this MS has in common with अ₁ and अ₂; No 73 at this point is available also in क₁ while No 42 deviates completely. This case, as well all the others seen above, except Crit. 39 of the Vāmana purāṇa, indicate that our MSS are not numerous enough to enable us to follow the evolution of our text. On the other hand what we have seen, while commenting on Vāmana 39 (Crit.), is enough to show that attention to the double numbering would be useful in reconstructing a little of the history of the text and the alliances of the MSS. In this case, moreover, even more than in some others, access to original MSS is essential in order to know whether the two numberings belong to the same hand or to two different hands; or if one looks perhaps like a correction of the other etc. These problems remain unsolved for our three purāṇa-s. But this discussion shows, at least, that the colophons can offer rich sources of new information.

c. Interruption in Counting

The counting of the *adhyāya*-s is also often interrupted in our three purāṇa-s, either because the entire colophon, or the number of the *adhyāya* is missing. Any minor reason perhaps could be sufficient to make the copyist copy the number improperly or forget to write any number at all. A single interruption in counting,

therefore, or a mistake in the right succession of numbers should not bother us, as it is not productive to this discussion. Yet we may deduce in some cases bits of information regarding the history of the text and providing help in grouping the MSS.

It is not infrequent that from the regular or irregular counting we gain insights as to whether a missing *adhyāya* in a MS was missing also in the whole recension represented by that MS, or it is just missing in this copy of the MS.

In the Kūrma purāṇa (Critical Edition) the *Pūrvabhāga* has 51 *adhyāya*, MS ६4, although its last *adhyāya* bears No 53, has in fact only 45 *adhyāya*-s, because Crit. 28-33 are missing from it. As the numbers can sometimes be altered by different factors, as we mentioned above, the fact that the MS ends with No 53 is not enough proof to affirm that it must have actually had 53 *adhyāya*-s. So our problem is to know whether those six *adhyāya*-s which appear missing, when compared to the Critical Edition, were present in this recension or not. The counting of *adhyāya*-s can help us answer this question. Although the six *adhyāya*-s are missing, in fact, the counting is resumed later as if they were there. So we have No 29, then the six missing *adhyāya*-s and lastly No 36 exactly as if the *adhyāya*-s were present. So the counting reveals that the six missing *adhyāya*-s were available at the time of the writing of the numbers.

The same thing can be said of the three missing numbers in १1 (= Crit. I. 26-28), and in १1 (= Crit. II. 42). In other cases as well, we can discover whether the missing *adhyāya*-s of a MS were actually missing at the time of the copying of the present MS or not. For example, Varāha 72-79 (Crit.) is represented in ६2 in the following way :

69, 70, N., N., —, —, —, 73

Supposing that the two Ns represent, in fact, 71, 72, which is easily conjecturable, No 73 after the three missing *adhyāya*-s follows regularly after No 72. So at the time this MS was copied these three *adhyāya*-s were missing. We can also go one step further. MS १1 follows closely ६2 but has no numbers in its colophons. By this closeness we can deduce that the three missing *adhyāya*-s of १1

parallel the ones missing in दे२, and were most probably not present even when the MS was copied. One is tempted to apply the same reasoning also to the group of MSS दे१-४, which also lack these three *adhyāya*-s although the absence of numbers in the colophons makes the conclusion more uncertain as they belong to a group different from दे२ and न१. The same thing can be said for the group of Kashmiri MSS शा१, का१-२, कारा of the Vāmana purāṇa, which do not have the first nine *adhyāya*-s of the Saromāhātmya. The counting shows that they were missing even at the time they were copied. So also, since दे२ and न१ of the Vāmana purāṇa had no Saromāhātmya at the time they were copied, this theory gains further support by the fact that the counting of their *adhyāya*-s continues as if they were not there.

So the interruption or the lack of interruption of counting in a MS can result in discovering a bit of the history of a MS and not improbably of the text itself.

The disruption in counting is not always in connection with missing *adhyāya*-s. In most cases the number is simply not given for one or more *adhyāya*-s and is resumed later.

All the cases appearing in our three purāṇa-s can be classified under two main groups : the first is the case when although one or more *adhyāya*-s do not bear any number, the counting is resumed later as if it had never been discontinued. For instance, Kūrma 19-23 (Crit.) are represented in व१ so : 18, N., N., N., 22; Varāha 64-66 (Crit.) have the correspondent in दे५ : 59, N., 61; Vāmana 29-33 (Crit.) are represented in दे४ so : 20, N., N., N., 24. Such cases can be multiplied; they show simply that the number was forgotten but that it was available in the MS from which the present one was copied.

The second group is represented by those instances where the resumed number is not the one we would expect and the *adhyāya*-s without number are, either more than they should be or less if we look at their serial number only.

Kūrma 19-23 (Crit.) is represented in व१ so : 19, N., N., N., 22. Instead of 22 there should be 23.

Varāha 1(-13 (Crit.) is represented in दे९ so : 9, N., N., 11.

Varāha 39-42 (Crit.) is in दे५ : 35, N., N., 37 and 94-100 (Crit.) is in दे२ ; 89, N., N., N.,—, N., 90

Vāmana SMā 10-12 (Crit.) is in दे७ : 10, N., 11

These instances can be multiplied to a great extent, and should be studied individually to discover whether such irregularities are due to carelessness of copyists, to addition of new *adhyāya*-s or to other possible reasons.

Examples in which the *adhyāya*-s are less than they should be are :

Kūrma II. 13-15 (Crit.) in न१ : 62,—, 65

Varāha 79-82 (Crit.) represented in न१ as : 81, N., N., 87

87-89 (Crit.) represented in न१ as : 92, —, 95

92-94 (Crit.) is in दे२ : 84, N., 89

112-114 (Crit.) is in दे२ : 102, N., 115

These cases are less numerous than the previous ones but as the previous ones cannot be grouped together as a whole, they should be studied attentively and individually and with the help of other sources as well. Interruption and resuming of counting in MSS especially when they spread over many *adhyāya*-s show that the MSS were copied or dictated from other earlier MSS. The hypothesis of dictation, actually, is the best to explain certain factors which otherwise would not have taken place, had the numbers been copied directly by sight. The clearest example seems to be in MS दे१० of Varāha (=Crit. 50). दे१० has the same numbers as the Critical Edition, but abruptly it has the following sequence : 49, 15, 51. Here *adh.* 15, which sounds like पञ्चदशोऽध्यायः in Sanskrit, stands surely for *adh.* 50, which sounds like पञ्चाशोऽध्यायः. The two words sound quite similar and could be easily confused especially by a less educated scribe who could misinterpret them and understand पञ्चाशोऽध्यायः for पञ्चदशोऽध्यायः and vice-versa. Such a mistake would not occur by careless copying as दे१० does not write the words for the numbers but only the figures. On the other hand the mistake was due to 'mishearing', or 'misunderstanding' most probably of the Sanskrit word. Hence we conclude that the number was dictated. We do not know, however, whether the copy from which the dictation was given contained only figures or

words. The number, however, was pronounced and surely not shown. Less clear is the process through which in the same MS, two *adhyāya*-s earlier, 18 is given in place of 48 (= Crit. 48).

दे₁ and दे₈ in Kūrma II. 20-22 (= Crit.) have the following sequence : 20, 19, 22. No 19 in place of No 21 cannot be a mistake of copying as the two figures are so different, but rather of interpreting what was heard, unless, of course, the dictation was wrong, i. e., in place of एकविंश it was dictated, heard or interpreted as एकोनविंश. The fact, then, that the next *adhyāya*-s have their proper number seems to imply that these latter were present in the MS which served for dictation. A few other cases can be found : see Varāha 73 (Crit.) in दे₉, 75 (Crit.) in म₁.

Other mistakes, however, are the results of mistakes of copying. दे₁₀, which writes figures, not words here, in place of Varāha 64-67 (Crit.) has the following sequence : 60, N., 32, 63. ६ has been read as ३. All the cases where “विंश” or its compounds have been interpreted as “त्रिंश” or the opposite, are again based on wrong reading and not on dictation.

The colophons, then, at least in some case, also help us understand the way a MS, or at least a part of it, was transmitted.

d. Repetition of Numbers

The same number of an *adhyāya* is often repeated in two or even three adjacent chapters. The apparent reason for such a repetition seems to be the copyists' mistake, either done in the very act of writing the number, or as a kind of readjusting a previous mistake which had made the numbering discordant from the exemplar MS. Often the repetition takes place when either the numbers of both the *adhyāya*-s or at least one of them, is given in figures. Mistakes, as is known, are easier in writing figures than words. These repetitions of the same number, however, are difficult to reconcile with copying from a text where the numbers are already written, or from dictation. They fit better the case of a numbering given independently, i. e., after the text had already been fully written, either by the same copyist or by another hand.

To check this last assertion we should see the MS itself. This also, however, would not solve all the problems because such a process might have taken place before the actual MS was copied and the mistakes repeated, i. e., the MS was copied as it was. So, if such 'later additions' cannot be proved for the present MS, we have then through it, evidence of a previous stage of the MS copy.

c. Influence from Other MSS

There are a few instances where the strangeness of counting seems to be due to the influence of another MS either of the same group or of another.

MS ३₁ of Kūrma purāṇa is rather accurate in the numbers which generally correspond to those of the Critical Edition. From I. 43 (Crit.), however, the MS has for three successive *adhyāya*-s a double number, as we have already seen, one continues the previous numbering and the other starts from No 46. This new counting continues till the end of the *Pūrvabhāga*, even when the double numbers stop, except for No 48 (Crit.). Here is the comparison :

Crit. 43,	44,	45,	46,	47,	48,	49,	50,	51
३ ₁ 43/46,	44/47,	45/48,	49,	50,	48,	52,	53,	54

Both in the *adhyāya*-s with double numbers and in ३₁ 48 (= Crit. 48) we may suppose the presence of an external influence and not a mere mistake as seen in Vāmana 39 (Crit.).³ But looking at the collated MSS used in preparing this critical edition we do not find any other MS having the second counting nor a parallel MS with No 48 where ३₁ has it. So we are left with doubt about influences from other MSS.

The case of MS ३₂ in Kūrma I. 49-51 (Crit.) is clearer. This MS has the following succession : 48-52-50. In the counting, ३₂ follows the MSS ३₃-5, upto 48, while for the *adhyāya* 52 the MS has the same number as ३₁.8-10. It is not improbable, then, that No 52 is due to the influence of another MS which had such a number at this point. And clearly the MS was not the one from which ३₂ was being copied, because later the counting continues with No 50, as if

3. See p. 363.

instead of 52 there was 49. If we suppose that the exemplar MS already had such a distortion, we have simply to shift the problem to some earlier stage of transmission. The insertion of No 52 in this point, whenever it took place, is thus due to the influence of another MS with different numbering.

Another example is in दे₁ of the Vāmana purāṇa, Saromāhātmya. The Critical 21, 22, 23, 24 are represented in दे₁ so : 40, 43, N., 45. Here the counting jumps from No 40 to 43 and then it proceeds regularly. Now, two other MSS, namely दे₃ and दे₁₀ belonging to the same group, according to A. S. Gupta in his introduction to the Critical Edition, have in these *adhyāya*-s the regular succession : 42, 43, 44, 45. It is not improbable, then, that the new counting was established through the influence of MSS other than the exemplar used for copying दे₁. The numbers of this MS दे₁, however, are not always accurate or quite regular and so this new counting starting with No 43 and corresponding to the other MSS दे₃ and दे₁₀ could be interpreted as a re-establishment of a numbering which had become irregular through the carelessness of copyists. But this No 43, present in three MSS, and at this point, has surely influenced MS दे₅. This later MS gives numbers in the whole purāṇa only four times, namely in Crit. 17, where it has No 16 as do several other MSS; in Crit. SMā 12 and 20, where it has No 8 and No 6 respectively, not shared by any other MS and in our *adhyāya*, i. e., in Crit. SMā 22 where it has No 43. It seems natural to think that these four numbers of MS दे₅ are due to the influence of different MSS, even if it is not possible to know when such an influence took place and which MSS influenced it.

Another case, apparently easy, is in Vāmana purāṇa 39 (Crit.). At this point we have this situation :

Crit.	38, 39,	40
दे ₁	64, 30,	31
दे ₃	63, 30,	31
दे ₄	29, 30,	29+
दे ₁₁	N., 30/61,	61

+A mistake for 31, possibly.

The only regular succession is दे४, where No 30 is in its right place. Such a number seems to have influenced the other three MSS, although in different ways. दे१ and दे३, from this *adhyāya* onward, change their numbering shifting it from 63 or 64 to 30 etc., while दे११ has a double number but then continues its old counting. It seems, however, rather evident that in all cases दे४ (or another MS with such numbering) influenced their numbering.

दे७ of Vāmana purāṇa, finally, represents again another case, similar to दे५ seen above for Saromāhātmya 22 (Crit.). Here also, like there, the MS does not give the number for several *adhyāya*-s but then in Crit. 61, suddenly it gives No 88, which is completely isolated and does not fit at all in the numbering this MS was following previously, and which was stopped with No 18 at Crit. 52, i. e., only nine *adhyāya*-s before. This isolated number 88, then, has no logic at all in this MSS, but it is equal to the number 88 of MS दे१०, where it has its right place. It is not improbable then that दे७ was influenced by दे१० or a similar MS. Such an influence, as said before, did not necessarily occur in the copy of the MS we are considering now; it may have happened earlier and then been faithfully reproduced in the present copy. This influence, at any rate, took place at some point of time in the transmission and evolution of this MS.

f. Miscellaneous

It is almost impossible to refer to all the 'events' described by the colophons of the three purāṇa-s we are considering in the short space of this article. The more one looks at the colophons the more one discovers new things and is puzzled by new problems. Here a few more examples will be presented.

The last colophon of every purāṇa almost always gives details regarding the time, the writing, the copyist of the MS, the *śici* of contents, and other data which help in the study of the text and which have thus been used in the introduction to the Critical Edition. Such pieces of information need not be repeated here. There are, however, other quite interesting facts apparent in the colophons for which an answer is still wanting.

MS दे९ of Varāha in Crit. 17, MS ब१ in Crit. 75; MS दे८ in Crit. 77, MS दे२ and दे१० in Crit. 129 and दे१० in Crit. 139, MS दे११ in Crit. 140ff, MS ब१ in Crit. 179, MS ब३ in Crit. 181, MS ब१ in Crit. 192; Vāmana Saromāhātmya : MS दे५ in Crit. 12 and 20, MS कारा in Crit. 44, all have a number not at all connected with either their own previous or subsequent counting, or with any of the other collated MSS. If such strange insertions are not due to the whim of the copyists, we have some evidence of the existence of other MSS having such a numbering.

We have a case in the Varāha where the interplay between the carelessness or whim of the copyist and the strength of the MS tradition is quite evident. Crit. 104-121 is represented in दे८ in the following way :

105, 96, 97, 96, 99, 100, 101, N., 103, 104, N., 106, N., 106, 109, 110, 111, 122

No 122 comes exactly in its right place as if No 105 of the beginning had been followed by Nos 106, 107 etc., and the counting then continues regularly. So the whole chaotic counting between 105 and 122 was the result of the whim of the copyist, but the copy from which the text was taken must have had a complete and orderly succession to allow the copyist to resume the counting in the right way. Naturally such a corruption of the text may have taken place at different times of the text's transmission.

Similar cases seem rather frequent and so the interplay between the old numbering and the new numbering due to purposeful change, influence of other MSS and the whim of copyists is not unlikely. MS ते१ in Varāha 150-169 (Crit.) seems also to have had such a kind of multiple interplay. The same for अ३ in Varāha 178-189 (Crit.), where the counting is resumed in the right way after a long interruption and apparently not by mere chance. No 4, in fact, which is inserted in between (cf. Crit. 181) without any connection at all with other MSS is not considered in the count, as it is proper. The same thing is repeated, with due variants, in Kūrma I. 31-34 (Crit.) by अ२ and most probably also in Kūrma 32-40 (Crit.) by अ१ and in Vāmana 42-46 (Crit.) by दे११.

There are two cases, one in Kūrma and the other in Vāmana, which seem to suggest that the mistake presented in their numbering at this point, was the result of prior copying and that the present copies of the MSS reproduce faithfully what was written in the exemplar.

MSS ५2, ५1, ३1 दे३-4, 8-10 in Kūrma II. 28-30 (Crit.) have the succession 28, 19, 30. No 19 is clearly a mistake for 29. Now it is highly improbable that eight MSS might have committed the same mistake simultaneously. It is, therefore, sensible to suppose that the mistake was already present in the MSS and was copied faithfully. How such a mistake crept in is a matter of conjecture: we may think that it started with one MS and then it spread. We may also think that not all these mistakes are interdependent; it is possible that also individual casual mistakes may have occurred, but it is difficult to imagine that all the eight copyists made the same mistake in just the very copies we happen to possess at present.

The other case is in Vāmana 43-46 (Crit.). The MSS with mistakes in this point are ५1-३, दे१ and दे४. They have :

५1 34, 25, 36, 27

५2 N., 35, 36, 27

दे१ 34, 35, 26, N.

दे४ 34, 35, 26, N.

No 25 of ५1 is an isolated mistake and could have been committed either by the copyist of this MS or it could have been there already and just re-copied. Regarding the other two mistakes of दे१-४, i. e., No 26 instead of 36, and of ५1-३, No 27 instead of 37, it is more difficult to accept the theory that the present copyists are responsible. The case is similar to the previous one, but since the mistakes are present only in two MSS the hypothesis is far less secure.

The last two examples given here, however, suggest the possibility of also discovering the origin of mistakes in a MS by considering its colophons.

2 THE PROBLEM OF THE NAME OF PURĀṆA AND ADHYĀYA

We have so far considered only or mainly the numbers given in the colophons. Now we must give attention to their words.

The Critical Apparatus of the three purāṇa-s we are studying divides the words of the colophons under two headings : the name of purāṇa and the name of *adhyāya*. The distinction is not always rigid, the usual separation-mark between the two being more an external than an internal criterion. If the description is put in the locative, it should be considered to refer to the purāṇa or to some broader unit than the single *adhyāya*, if it is in the nominative then it should be considered to refer to the *adhyāya*. A perusal of colophons, however, shows that such a division could not be applied in all cases in the Critical Edition.

The Critical Apparatus of Kūrma I. 16 puts under the name *adhyāya* वामनप्रादुर्भावे of व२, दे३.५.६ and त्रिविक्रमचरिते of दे१-२.८-१० and मुए as well as वामनप्रादुर्भावो नाम of दे१, प्र१-२ and त्रिविक्रमचरितवर्णनं नाम of मुवे.

The Critical Apparatus of Varāha 74 considers रुद्रगीतासु भुवनकोशे of दे५ as the name of the purāṇa, while the same expression is considered name of the *adhyāya* by the Critical Apparatus of *adhyāya* 75. This shows that the division between the two headings is somewhat artificial, although it is normally rather useful, especially if it is not accepted with rigidity.

The first and last *adhyāyas* of the purāṇa, or of a *bhāga*, or even of a sub-topic, are particularly accurate in almost all the MSS. The other *adhyāya*-s instead have usually very short colophons. The beginning and the end of the purāṇa, hence, may be considered to have the exact name of the purāṇa, sometimes the date, the place of copying and the scribe's name. These details are usually studied by scholars and the pertinent conclusions have already been ascertained. But we can use this tendency of being more accurate in the first, and especially the last *adhyāya* of a *bhāga*, or of a subdivision, to confirm that the part we are considering has really reached an end. It can even be a hint that the *adhyāya*-s had a life independent of the rest of the purāṇa in which they are now inserted. Although this is only a hint, it has to be taken under serious consideration though it should also be confirmed by other facts as well. The section, described as वामनप्रादुर्भाव in the Vāmana purāṇa, is called by this name :

in <i>adh</i>	1	by 2 MSS
	2	2
	3	—
	4	—
	5	—
	6	8
	7	—
	8	1

The tendency mentioned above would suggest that the वामनप्रादुर्भाव ended with *adhyāya* 6 or at least that this colophon was the last of this section. In fact, however, the *adhyāya* deals with कामदाह which appears also in the name of *adhyāya* given in this same colophon. The topic is Śaiva not Vaiṣṇava and it can hardly refer to वामनप्रादुर्भाव. So we have to suppose, as implied above, that this part of the colophon describing a sub-division of the purāṇa is older than the text itself, and that it was left unchanged even though it no longer matches the section to which it is allied. MS B₁, which has वामनप्रादुर्भाव also in *adh.* 8, i.e., after the conclusion of the section, might have used it because that *adhyāya*, 8, deals with Vaiṣṇava material. In this case, then, the word would not be a remnant of an older stage of the purāṇa as in the previous cases, but an innovation of the particular scribe of this MS.

The topic '*vamśa*' is dealt with in Kūrma I 13-26. The colophons use the expression वंशानुकीर्तने or a similar one in the following rate :

<i>adh</i>	13	in 11 MSS
	14	—
	15	1
	16	—
	17	10
	18	14
	19	13
	20	15
	21	12
	22	8
	23	12
	24	6
	25	4
	26	10

Although the sequence of this rate presents the highest numbers in the middle, the rule of having also accurate description in most of MSS at the end is kept; and the unit of this topic is well defined both at its beginning and at its end.

A tendency which may sometimes interfere with the example just given occurs very often and requires further consideration. Not infrequently we find MSS which, although usually having inaccurate colophons, all of a sudden have one or more *adhyāya*-s with very accurate and detailed colophons. This process is even more evident when it happens simultaneously in many MSS of the same *adhyāya*. Such is the case of Vāmana 11 (Crit.) where unexpectedly all the collated MSS present uniformly पुष्करद्वीपवर्णनं नाम, with the exception of MS कारा. The fact is more evident for the group of MSS ब१-३, दे४.७.११ and ते१ which are rather irregular about giving the names of *adhyāya*-s in this part of the text, but all of a sudden have this *adhyāya*, and a few others, uniformly described in their colophons. A rather reasonable suggestion to understand this phenomenon is to suppose that these *adhyāya*-s are fresh insertions, i. e., added to the purāṇa in a more recent time from that of the other *adhyāya*-s. Even the clearly defined booklets, like *Īśvaragītā* of Kūrma, *Vārāṇasīmāhātmya* or *Prayāgamāhātmya* of Vāmana have more accurate colophons in almost all the MSS and we know that these parts are later imports. This, then, seems to confirm that an accurate colophon in all the MSS indicates a more recent date for that specific *adhyāya*. In the same perspective we can think that a colophon may be used by some author with the intention of establishing a new trend in the purāṇa.

a. Name of Purāṇa

The three purāṇa-s studied here have rather uniform descriptions of the name of the purāṇa in the colophons. There are a few things which, however, deserve additional attention:

While Vāmana purāṇa is not qualified as आदि, both Kūrma and Varāha bear the title of आदि but in two different ways. Kūrma is usually called श्री आदिमहापुराणे कूर्मे (or कौर्मे), with rare exceptions—see Crit. I. 11 in MS ब१ which has इत्यादि कौर्मे. So, although the

word आदि in the latter purāṇa may have the same general meaning of 'important', 'great', as it has in the former, its very position makes the statement of the Introduction to the Varāha (English translation) that आदि may refer also to आदिवराह completely justified. Not improbably there is a kind of pun, आदि keeping both in meanings. The word आदि could be attached directly to वराह because in literature there is in fact an 'Ādivarāha', but it was not attached to कूर्म because there is no Ādikūrma in literature.

Kūrma purāṇa has two *bhāga*-s which are described also in Nārada I. 106 as पूर्वभाग and उत्तरभाग. The colophons, although keeping the two *bhāga*-s, present a different situation. The पूर्वभाग is there so called only in the last *adhyāya*, while उत्तरभाग has different names in the MSS : उत्तरखण्ड, उत्तरार्ध, उपरिभाग and उपरिविभाग, which was accepted by the Critical Edition as the 'official name'. So the two *bhāga*-s have a completely different treatments in the MSS. From what has been said so far about the momentum of the colophons, it seems that this very situation of MSS on this topic should lead us to think that the two present *bhāga*-s did not have the same origin but that they are two parts juxtaposed. It may not even be completely out of logic to think that the *adhyāya*-s having the same type of description may belong to the same 'group' : so we would have *adhyāya*-s of the उत्तरार्ध, *adhyāya*-s of the उत्तरभाग and so on. Whether these *adhyāya*-s of different groups had also a separate life needs further research.

The Varāha purāṇa is described in almost all its colophons as भगवच्छास्त्र. Such a word is not mentioned in Nārada I. 103, nor is it available in the group of *adhyāya*-s 39-47, and a few others not noted here. Is there any reason why this section has no such a word, or is it only mere chance? Further research is needed surely. It should be noted, however, that the *adhyāya*-s 39-50 form a sort of booklet called चरणीव्रत and that no MS of this booklet has the definition भगवच्छास्त्र upto adh. 47. As for the other next *adhyāya*-s : in 48 such a description appears only in MSS दे१.४ but the two MSS have no text of the *adhyāya*, they have only the colophon; in adh. 49 it is present only in MS दे४. In *adhyāya* 50 it is

available in several MSS. So the only difficulty comes from this latter *adhyāya*, which is the conclusion of the booklet. It is not improbable, then, that this 'booklet' was 'built up' with additional *adhyāya*-s (those without भगवच्छास्त्र) from a previous few *adhyāya*-s (those with भगवच्छास्त्र) of the same topic.

There are a few fascinating descriptions in the three purāṇa-s we are considering which, if they were more numerous, would lead us to a better understanding of the structure of the purāṇa-s. Unfortunately their irregularity is such that not even the least conclusion or hypothesis can be drawn.

In Kūrma there are 12 *adhyāya*-s claiming to belong to a षट् साहस्रिकायां संहितायाम् and 3 *adhyāya*-s to a वैयासिक्यां संहितायाम्. In Varāha one *adhyāya* says it belongs to a चतुर्विंशतिसाहस्रिकायां संहितायाम्. 4 *adhyāya*-s describe themselves as belonging to वैयासिक्याम् and one is called वैशंपायनीय. Vāmana purāṇa, at last, has one *adhyāya*, the 28th, where MS ब₁ says पारमहंस्यां संहितायां वैयासिक्याम्. At this we can add the long section, *adh.* 35-96, of the Varāha-purāṇa and some 14 *adhyāya*-s at random, where almost all the colophons have the description प्राणितिहास. All these are at present only words, very suggestive indeed, but not more than that; they are enough to make us understand, however, that the colophons are persistently offering suggestions toward the discovery of a time when the purāṇa-s had a shape other than the present one.

b. Name of Adhyāya

Each *adhyāya* has its name, which presents one of the topics dealt with in the *adhyāya* itself, most probably the one considered somewhat more important for any reason whatsoever. Not infrequently one topic extends over more than one *adhyāya*, so the few *adhyāya*-s dealing with that topic may bear the same name or may be given two names, one referring to the larger theme and the other describing more closely the specific topic of the *adhyāya*. So we may have kinds of units or small sections formed of a few or several *adhyāya*-s. Often such sections are concluded in the colophon with the word समाप्तम्. Such sections may have belonged to the more ancient form of the purāṇa or have been added later, but by the very fact of being easily definable and even with a beginning and

an end clearly recognizable make their 'mobility' easier. So, even if they were originally composed for the purāṇa itself they may have had, later, an independent life more easily than other parts not so clearly defined. Their very independence may have transformed them more or less. Small sections, of course, are easily recognizable and if they are compact they can be easily assigned to recent additions or old sections. We have many examples of such small sections in our three purāṇa-s; here are the clearest and most important.

In Kūrma purāṇa we can see:

—युगधर्मकीर्तनम्	— 2 <i>adhyāya</i> -s	(I.27-28)
—वाराणसीमाहात्म्यम्	— 5 -do-	(I.29-33)
—प्रयागमाहात्म्यम्	— 4 -do-	(I.34-37)
—ईश्वरगीता	— 11 -do-	(II.1-11)
—तीर्थप्रशंसा	— 5 -do-	(II.33-37)

In Varāha purāṇa :

—रैम्यचरितम्	— 4 <i>adhyāya</i> -s	(5-8)
—दुर्जयचरितम्	— 3 -do-	(10-12)
—धरणीव्रतम्	— 12 -do-	(39-50)
—अगस्त्यगीता	— at least 19 <i>adhyāya</i> -s	(52-71)
—मुवनकोश	— at least 7 -do-	(89-96)
—रुद्रगीता	— 19 <i>adhyāya</i> -s	(70-88)
—मथुरामाहात्म्यम्	— 29 -do-	(150-178)
—गोकर्णेश्वरमाहात्म्यम्	— 5 -do-	(211-215)

etc.

In Vāmana purāṇa :

—मुवनकोशः (or सुकेशिचरितम्)	— 6 <i>adhyāya</i> -s	(11-16)
—देवीमाहात्म्यम्	— 3 -do-	(19-21)

etc.

When the *adhyāya*-s are many, or the topic is rather vast, like the Vāmana's वामनप्रादुर्भाव, शैरवप्रादुर्भाव, the section can become very extensive and be a kind of 'collection' of many topics loosely related among themselves. Such sections may recall to mind the *samhitā*-s

of which the purāṇa-s are sometimes said to be composed.⁴ Such *samhitā*-s, of course, can grow endlessly and contain also other sub-sections. The Vāmana purāṇa is a good example of such a development. Its scheme given below, prepared only on the basis of the colophons evidence, shows exactly this situation :

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| 1. वामनप्रादुर्भाव
adhs. 1-8 | 1. हरललित
adhs. 1-5 |
| 2. भैरवप्रादुर्भाव
adhs. 9-21 | 2. भुवनकोश
(or सुकेशिचरित)
adhs. 11-16 |
| | 3. देवीमाहात्म्य
adhs. 18.38-21 |
| | —उमासंभव—उमा (शोरी) विवाह
upto adhs. 30 |
| 3. भैरवप्रादुर्भाव
adhs. 28-44 | —कौमारसंभव
adhs. 31-32 |
| | —दण्डोपाख्यान
adhs. 37-45 |
| 4. वामनप्रादुर्भाव
adhs. 44-68 | 4. प्रह्लादतीर्थयात्रा
adhs. 52-61 |
| | 5. त्रिविक्रमचरित
upto adhs. 68 |

It appears, then, that the topics are gathered in sections which can be arranged, as in the above scheme, into two or three streams : the first is represented by the general sections which are वामनप्रादुर्भाव, भैरवप्रादुर्भाव, and again वामनप्रादुर्भाव; the second is represented by several themes which run parallel to the first : हरललित, भुवनकोश, प्रह्लादतीर्थयात्रा, त्रिविक्रमचरित. The देवीमाहात्म्य is parallel to the more general theme भैरवप्रादुर्भाव but has, on its turn, topics which are subordinate to it, although its name does not appear. So at this point there are in fact three contemporaneous streams.

The Saromāhātmya, not put in the above scheme, is a kind of *samhitā* by itself inserted into the body of the Vāmana

4. Brahmanḍa II. 34.21; Devī Bhāgavata I. 1.6; I. 2.37; I. 3.24 ff; Liṅga I. 1.11 ab; Nārada I. 1.16; II. 82.35 cd; Padma II. 1.25.38; Skanda VII. 1.1.4,30....; Viṣṇu III 6.15; cf. also Purāṇa XXII No. 1 (Jan., 1980) pp. 48-52.

purāṇa; the reason for its acceptance in the Critical Edition has been explained in the Introduction to the Vāmana by A. S. Gupta. Such a *māhātmya* contains at least a वामनचरित as a distinguishable unit. Problematic remains the new counting started by MS दे७ in SMā 23 (Crit.). Whether another section began from this point or not cannot be determined. From what was said both for Saromāhātmya and for the rest of the Vāmana purāṇa there is no doubt that at least some purāṇa-s contain co-existent sections, which apparently interfered reciproally and had possibly also an independent life of their own.

Such sections or sub-sections are marked by the colophons in some cases with words like समाप्तम् or other special words. So दे१.३-४ of Varāha has प्रथमोद्देशः (see Crit. 111), Varāha 97 (Crit.) in all the MSS, except दे१.७, म१ gives पंचाध्यायः. Both words suppose an end of a part; the first supposes the existence of other उद्देश-s, which no longer exist, not even in the MS having that word, and the second suggests the existence of a *śūci* or summary in that *adhyāya*, but such a summary is not available even in the MS containing that very expression. So both the words take us back to a stage of the purāṇa previous to the present one.

Other words hint possibly at divisions of the text no longer apparent in the present one. The Varāha purāṇa has several *adhyāya*-s called *sarga*-s. The reason of such a denomination is not clear. Did such *adhyāya*-s, which now alternate the two words सर्ग and अध्याय, form group by themselves? Sections could be determined by words like आदिसर्ग, आदिवृत्तान्त available in Varāha purāṇa or by special description of the *adhyāya*-s applied only to a specific group of *adhyāya*-s as in the case of the 'Īśvaragītā' of the Kūrma purāṇa where the *adhyāya*-s are said to belong, in the colophons, to ईश्वरगीतासु उपनिषत्सु ब्रह्मविद्यायां योगशास्त्रे.

Not infrequently long sections are formed under a general description of a dialogue between two persons, for instance ईश्वरनारायण महर्षिसंवाद of Kūrma II. 1-11.

A note of warning should be put here not to be misunderstood. In the previous paragraphs there has been constant reference to sections, units, topics and the like. That presentation may

convey the impression that the *adhyāya*-s forming the topics etc. were existing separately from the purāṇa and inserted in it by way of accretion. Such a process cannot be excluded, but cannot even be affirmed *a priori*. Such sections could be intrinsic parts of the purāṇa from its very original composition. Each case has to be studied separately. The fact of calling them 'sections' or the like, however, implies surely that they had more mobility because they were more definite and could be easily shifted from one place to another. The research done on the colophons till now shows the interesting fact that some of these sections changed in themselves without shifting. Some colophons continue to refer to them as if they continued to exist but the contents of their *adhyāya*-s are now different. It is just this discrepancy that allows us to have a peep into a previous stage of the purāṇa-s.

3. THE CHALLENGE OF COLOPHONS

The colophons offer, no doubt, many pieces of information about the contents and structure of the purāṇa-s. We have to consider, of course, only those colophons which really have something serious to say because, in fact, most of them are so carelessly transmitted that they have nothing to offer but confusion or nonsenses. To work on colophons is to work on difficult and slippery material.

Almost every time I got some result or conclusion by examining the colophons, such as a particular division of the text, or the information that a colophon was hinting at an older stage of the purāṇa etc., and I tried to check by looking into the text or by reading the conclusions to which R.C. Hazra and other scholars had arrived through other ways, I was disappointed. There has been hardly a case in which the result found by studying the colophons and the conclusions reached in other ways matched. The only slight success was that through the examination of the colophons I could sustain the opinion of Winternitz that the Vāmana purāṇa began with the account of the Vāmana avatāra, although at present no MS used in the Critical Edition mentions it. A meagre consolation indeed. For all practical purposes the colophons appear, at first, completely useless. To study them seems to be a mere academical exercise.

Yet we have seen that some colophons or some indications imposed by the colophons are quite important. We have seen how many times we were taken back to a previous stage of the puranic text. Indeed, it seems that the lack of counterproofs of what is implied by the colophons in the actual puranic text is exactly the real positive contribution of some colophons, i.e., the reliable ones ! They were surely written carelessly and just for that they were not always changed according to the new modifications inserted in the text. Or, to see the problem from another perspective, those who introduced new material in the puranic text did not care to change also the colophons accordingly. However, if we reconstruct the scheme and the contents of the purāṇa-s by using only the colophons we get, in some points, a picture of the purāṇa totally different from the present one. The tendency to be more conservative, which we have noted on several occasions in the colophons, makes us postulate that the difference between the two contents of the purāṇa-s, the one described by the colophons and the present one, is of great importance and one which should be attentively considered. It appeared already, in fact, that in some cases such a difference shows us topics of a previous stage of the purāṇa. And that stage, we have seen in one instance at least, can be antecedent to the scheme in Nārada purāṇa I.92-109. If the study of the single *adhyāya*-s may lead us to find older and more recent passages or *adhyāya*-s, the study of the colophons may lead us to discover the structure of a part or of the whole purāṇa. The colophons, therefore, remain as a persistent challenge to go further in our research and penetrate deeper in the process of the evolution of the puranic text.

BUDDHA AS DEPICTED IN THE PURĀṆAS

By

RAM SHANKAR BHATTACHARYA

It is well known that the authors of the current Purāṇas (which include here the Upapurāṇas and the Epics) were aware of Buddha or the Buddha (on account of his attaining *bodhi*, supreme wisdom)—the founder of a particular system of thought. Almost all the Purāṇas are found to refer to this great thinker.¹ In the following pages an attempt is made to depict the life and activities of Buddha on the basis of the Purāṇas. Only in some important places we have thought it useful to quote from the Tantras and other non-Purāṇic works. Views of Buddhist tradition have also been shown whenever necessary.

A careful study of the statements about Buddha (as quoted here) reveals that *all of them are not referring to one and the same person*. We want to draw the attention of our readers to this remarkable point.

In the absence of the critical editions of all the Purāṇas we have thought it better to refrain from holding any discussion on textual criticism or on spuriousness of any of the Purāṇic statements quoted here.

The word buddha

In the Purāṇas the word *buddha* is found to have been used either as an adjective² (from the root *budh*, to know with the suffix

1. That passages on Buddha were present in the Purāṇas before the time of Kumārila is undoubtedly proved from his statement in the Tantravārttika on Mīmāṃsā-sūtra 1.3.7 (स्मर्यते च पुराणेषु धर्मविप्लुतिहेतवः । कलौ शाक्यादयस्तेषां को वाक्यं श्रोतुमर्हति ॥; it is quoted in the Tantrādhikārinirṇaya pp. 9-10 (with the reading तेषां को वा संश्रोतुमर्हति).
2. एतद् बुद्ध्वा भवेद् बुद्धः किमन्यद् बुद्धलक्षणम् (Śānti-p. 285. 32; cp. Brahma-p. 237.11) अतीतानागतं ज्ञानं दर्शनं संप्रतस्य च । बुद्धस्य समतां याति दीप्तिः स्यात् तप उच्यते ॥ (Vāyu-p. 11 9). व्यपेततन्निर्धर्मात्मा शक्त्या सत्पथमाश्रितः । चारित्र्यपरमो बुद्धो ब्रह्मभूयाय कल्पते ॥ (Anuśāsana-p. 142.33; the verse describes a per-

kṛta denoting the sense of an agent: कर्तरि क्तः) or as a noun referring to a particular person who was regarded as an incarnation of Viṣṇu by the authors of the Purāṇas. A few Purāṇic verses are found to refer to Buddha though they do not contain the word Buddha or its synonyms. As for example Nāradiya 1.2.44 extols Buddha though it does not mention the name even indirectly.³

Buddha has been referred to in the Purāṇas by the following three names also : Buddhadeva (Padma-p. 6.31.15), Buddharūpa (Brahma-p. 122.69) and Siddhārtha (Matsya-p. 271.12).

Mention of Buddha in the Purāṇas

Buddha has been mentioned in the Purāṇic passages that either (1) show eulogy or glory of Viṣṇu (especially in those passages that enumerate the ten incarnations of Viṣṇu)⁴ or (2) contain

son in the Vānaprastha state); The adjective *buddha* has been used in connection with various deities, namely Śiva, Viṣṇu, etc. (Līṅga-p. 1.21.10, 40; Kūrma p. 1.6.15, 1.10.48; Harivaṃśa-p. 3.3.25, Padma p. Bhūmi 31.43). Similarly the word *sugata* (frequently used by the Buddhist teachers for Buddha) has been used in Līṅga-p. 1.21.50 in the sense of 'one whose *gata* i.e. *jñāna* is perfect'. *Buddha* as an adjective may also be derived from the word बुद्धि with the secondary suffix अच् according to Pāṇini 5.2.127.

3. मन्त्रोक्तं यत् सन्तुष्टात्मानमात्मनि । पश्यन्ति निर्मलं शुद्धं तमीशानं
(Nāradiya-p. 1.2.24; the reading seems to be corrupt); the stanza occurs in the Br-Nāradiya-p. 1.2.24. (संहृत्त्यात्मानमात्मना । पश्यन्ति योगिनः सर्वे तमीशानं). These verses refer to Buddha is beyond doubt, for they glorify Viṣṇu and they are read after the verses referring to Paraśurāma, Rāma and Balarāma.

4. Brahma-p. 122.69; Padma-p. Bhūmi 18.66; 73.92; Padma-p. 31.15, 257.41, Padma-p. Kriyāyogasāra-p. 1.3.24, 2.7.37, 6.8.19, 10.40.22, Bhāgavata-p. 1.3.24, 2.7.37, 6.8.19, 10.40.22, Nāradiya-p. 1.2.44, 1.62.54, 2.29.42, 2.32.36; 1.6.1-2; Bhavisya-p. 4.12.25-29, 4.63.23, 6.83. Brahmaparivarta p. 4.9.12; Līṅga-p. 2.48. 31b-31c; 4.2, 55.37, 113.42, 211.69; Skanda-p. 1.4; Skanda-p. Revā 151.21-24; Skanda-p. 40.255-256; Skanda-p. Vāsudeva Mahātmya 1.1.32; Skanda-p. Sūtasamhitā 3.21; Matsya p. 47.247, 47.248; Garuḍa-p. 1.1.32, 1.86.10-11; 1.145.40, 1.145.41; Siva p. II. 2.16.11; II. 4.9.15; Devībhāgavata-p. 3.14; Viṣṇudharmottara-p. 3.351.54; Devī-p.

accounts of incarnations or forms of Viṣṇu. In a few Purāṇas Buddha is mentioned in the genealogical lists of (future) kings (vide Matsya-p. 271.12, etc.) or in the descriptions of Kaliyuga.⁶

A few Purāṇic passages (not found in the printed editions) on Buddha are found to have been quoted in the works on Dharma-śāstra etc. A considerable number of such passages have also been quoted in the present paper.

The Rāmāyaṇa passage यथा हि चौरः स तथा हि बुद्धस् तयागतं नास्तिक-मत्र विद्धि (Ayodhyā 109.34) which is taken as referring to Buddha (it is however regarded by many as an interpolation) does not, according to us, really refer to Buddha. The word *buddha* in this passage simply means 'a person possessing the *buddhi* (opinion, conviction) that has been described in the preceding verse (109.33).⁶ It may be easily observed that in spite of the use of the words *yathā* and *tathā*, there arises no logical difficulty in taking the word *buddho* in the aforesaid sense.⁷

6.5; Saura-p. 15.25; Br. dharma-p. 2.11.72; Narasimha-p. 36.9; Br. Nāradyā-p. 2.39; Kallhi-p. 2.3; Purāṇa-saṁhitā 8.81; Viṣṇudharma-p. ch. 66, (MS); Mbh. Sānti-p. 348.2; 348. 41-42 (Kum. ed.).

5. Brahmāṇḍa-p. 2.31.60; Brahma-p. 230.13; Āgneya-p. (MS) 29.41 (vide St. Up. I, p. 145).

6. निन्दाम्यहं कर्म कृतं पितुस्तद् यस्त्वामगृह्णाद् विषमस्थबुद्धिम् । बुद्ध्यान-यैवविधया चरन्तं सुनास्तिकं धर्मपथादपेतम् (Rāmāyaṇa 2.109.33).

7. It is remarkable to note that even the later Upaniṣads do not mention Buddha. Madhva, the teacher of the Dvaita school, has however quoted an Upaniṣad passage (on avatāra) which mentions Buddha (वासुदेवः संकर्षणः प्रद्युम्नोऽनि-रुद्धोऽहं सत्यः ... रामः कुष्णो बुद्धः कल्किरहं....). There is ample reason to doubt about the genuineness of this statement, for Jīva-gosvāmin in his Śrīkṛṣṇa-sandarbhā expressly declared that the aforesaid passage was to be taken as a Śruti statement on the authority of Madhva (मध्वभाष्य-प्रमाणिता श्रुतिः, p. 156, ed. Bhaktivicāra Yāyāvāra). About the genuineness of many of the Śruti passages quoted by Madhva in his works modern scholars have expressed their doubt; vide the article by Venkata Subbiya in Indian Antiquary of 1933 (p. 189).

Points to be observed in the aforesaid Purāṇic passages

Following points are to be observed in connection with the Purāṇic references to Buddha :

(i) Leaving only a few, almost all the Purāṇas refer to Buddha.

(ii) Non-mention is found in the older Purāṇas (like the Mārkaṇḍeya-p.) as well as in the later Purāṇas (like the Vāmana-p.).⁸

(iii) If Buddha is not mentioned in the list of the ten incarnations, then Kṛṣṇa, or some other incarnation is mentioned in order to complete the number.

(iv) Those Purāṇas that do not refer to Buddha sometimes mention the Bauddhas though disdainfully; *vide* Kūrma-p. 1.30-13; 2.21.32.

(v) While Buddha is invariably followed by Kalki (or Kalkin) in the lists of the ten incarnations of Viṣṇu, he is preceded by Balarāma or by Kṛṣṇa or by Vyāsa in different Purāṇas.

(vi) Some Purāṇas do not invariably mention Buddha in all of its passages that enumerate or deal with the incarnations of Viṣṇu. As for example, the Brahma-p. which mentions Buddha in 122.69 (in a eulogy to Viṣṇu) describes the incarnations of Viṣṇu without describing Buddha in ch. 213; The Śānti-p. 348.2 (Kum. ed.) refers to Buddha, but is silent (in a different recension) on Buddha in 339. 103-104 (which mention Haṁsa and Śātvata i. e. Kṛṣṇa); the Bhāgavatā-p. in more than one place mentions Buddha, but is silent on him in 10.2.40; the Bhaviṣya-p. mentions Buddha in 4.63.23 and 4. 190. 6-7 but is silent on him in 4.85.10 and 4. 76. 44.⁹

8. It is remarkable to note that the Prapañcasāra-tantra (ascribed to Śaṅkarācārya) does not mention Buddha while enumerating the ten incarnations of Viṣṇu (मत्स्यः कूर्मवराहौ नृसिंहकुब्जत्रिरामकृष्णाश्च । कल्किः सानन्तात्मा 1959); cp. the Lalitāsahasranāma-bhāṣya by Bhāskara : “क्रमेण मत्स्य-कूर्म-वराह-नरसिंह-वामन-भार्गव-दाशरथि-हलधर-कृष्ण-कल्कि-रूपदशावतारान् उत्पाद्य ते निषूदिताः, p. 49).

9. About the non-mention of Buddha as an incarnation in the Āgneya-purāṇa (i. e. Vahni-purāṇa which is older than and different from the current Agni-purāṇa) the observations of Dr. Hazra are worth noticing : “The

The place of reading Buddha's name in the list of incarnations.

In the Purāṇic enumerations of the ten incarnations of Viṣṇu, Buddha is mentioned usually in the ninth place; sometimes the word *navama* or *navamaka* has been used in connection with Buddha in these enumerations; *vide* Matsya-p. 47.247, Liṅga-p. 2.48. 30-32, Garuḍa-p. 1. 86. 10 11; 2. 20. 31-32, Śiva-p. 2. 4. 9. 25; Skanda-Revā. 151.21. Only in a few places Buddha's name is read in places other than nine.

In the accounts of Viṣṇu's forms or incarnations numbering much more than ten, no fixed place is given to Buddha though he is described in the 21st place in more than one Purāṇic chapter. It is to be noted that the order of names of the ten incarnations is generally fixed—it begins with Matsya and ends with Kalki. The order in which the forms or incarnations of Viṣṇu have been described elaborately in the Purāṇas does not seem to be so well-established as the order of the ten incarnations. It appears that the list of the ten incarnations was conceived to serve some purpose.

Buddha described as a yogin or a sannyāsin

In a few Purāṇic passages Buddha has been clearly described as a yogin.¹⁰ He is said to be a *yogācārya* in Śiva-p. II.5.16.11. In Agni-p. 49.8 Buddha has been described as शान्तात्मन् (having a pacified mind), ऊर्ध्वपद्मस्थित (its meaning is not clear, though it un-

mention of the ten incarnations of Viṣṇu in three places in the Āgneya-p. (ch. 3, 23 and 28) does not necessarily mean that the Buddha was one of them. Although the Buddha has been named as the founder of a heretical faith in Āgneya-p. 29.41 (fol. 102 b) there is not the slightest indication in this Purāṇa that he came to be regarded as an incarnation of Viṣṇu. This shows that the ten incarnations include both Kṛṣṇa and Balarāma instead of Buddha." (Studies in the Genuine Āgneya-purāṇa', in Our Heritage, Vol. III, p. 83, fn.)

10. चराबद्धपद्मासनस्थाङ्घ्रियष्टिर्नियम्यानिलं न्यस्तनासाग्रदृष्टिः । य आस्ते कलौ योगिनां चक्रवर्ती स बुद्धः प्रबुद्धोऽस्तु मच्चित्तवर्ती (Daśāvatāra-stotra attributed to Śaṅkarācārya, verse 9). As to why Siddhārtha was called Buddha, the statement in the Buddhist work Sūtroddesālaṅkāra is worthy of note (अनुगतमतीतमभ्युपेतं चरमचरं क्षयिताक्षयं च कृत्स्नम् । यत इह स बुबोध बोधिमूले बुधसहितो भगवान् ततः स बुद्धः ॥, quoted in the comm. Trikaṇḍa-cintāmaṇi on Amarakośa).

doubtedly suggests some secret yoga practice)¹¹; in Matsya-p. 54.19 he is described as शान्त and in Skanda-Revā 151.21 as शान्तिमत्; in Devī-purāṇa 6.5 he is described as शुद्धसद्भावभाव (whose ideas are purely holy), शुद्धबुद्धतनूद्भव (born of a purified body) and रागद्वेषविनिमुक्त (free from attachment and hatred); in Viṣṇudharma he is described as नराणामय नारीणां दयां भूतेषु दर्शयन् (*vide* Studies in the Upapurāṇas I p. 144) which is suggestive of Buddha's being a *sannyāsin*, for showing compassion to all creatures is one of the chief characteristics of *sannyāsin*.¹² The Purāṇic assertion that Buddha was clad in clothes of brown-red colour (काषायवस्त्रवसंवीत Śanti-p. 348.2 Kum. ed; Cr. ed. App. 1, no 31) also proves that he was a *sannyāsin*.¹³ Buddha is sometimes described as wearing a red cloth (रक्तवासस् Devī-p. 6. 5; रक्ताम्बरव्यञ्जिताङ्ग, Viṣṇudharma, Ch. 66; *vide* 'St. Up.' I. p. 144)—a view which is found in the philosophical works also¹⁴. The Viṣṇu-p. (3.17-18) speaks of मायामोह (who may be taken as a form of Buddha [Māyāmoha has been clearly stated as the same as Buddha in Agni-p. 16.2] as wearing red cloth (*raktapaṭa*). Are we to take *rakta* as the same as *kāṣāya* or to think that one of these two descriptions is older than the other or that there were two different views about the colour of Buddha's garment?

The names of the parents, wife and son of Buddha

In the Purāṇas Buddha's father is usually called शुद्धोदन¹⁵

11. Cp. the description of Buddha in the Merutantra :
पद्मे पद्मासनस्थं तमूर्वोर्न्यस्तकरद्वयम् । गौरमुण्डितसर्वाङ्गं व्यानस्तिमित-
लोचनम् ॥
12. G. Dh. S. 3.23-24; Yāj. Smṛti 3.61; Manu-smṛti 6.39.
13. The Bauddhas are often described in the Purāṇas as putting on brown-red garment; see 'काषायवाससः शुद्धा....शाक्यबुद्धो-
पजीविनः' (Brahmāṇḍa-p. 2.31.59-60); काषायिणश्च निर्ग्रन्था
बौद्धाः....भविष्यन्ति कलौ युगे (Saura-p. 4.24).
14. यथा रक्तपटानां विज्ञानावस्थानेऽपि.... (Śārīraka-bhāṣya 2.2.35);
रक्तपटधारणं वा दिगम्बरता वाऽवलम्ब्यताम् (Nyāyamañjarī, I, p. 244)
संघो रक्ताम्बरत्वं च शिष्ये बौद्धभिक्षुभिः (Vivekavilāsa 8.275).
15. शुद्धोदनसुतः.... (Agni-p. 16.2). शुद्धोदनस्य पुत्रोऽभूत् स्वयं देवो जनार्दनः
(Varāha-p. quoted in Kṛtyaratnākara, p. 248).
शाक्यात् शुद्धोदनो नृपः । शुद्धोदनस्य भविता सिद्धार्थः पुष्कलः सुतः ॥

—a view which is in consonance with the Buddhist tradition.¹⁶ There are also a few Purāṇic statements that declare that the name of his father is Añjana, Ajana, Ajina or even Jina.¹⁷ According to Buddhist tradition Añjana is the name of the father of Buddha's mother.¹⁸ The exact form of this second name (as mentioned in

(Matsya-p. 271.13). शुद्धोदनसुतो बुद्धो भविष्यामि (Viṣṇu-dharma; vide 'St. Up.' I, p. 144). वस्त्रपाणेः शुद्धोदनः, शुद्धोदनाद् बुधः, बुधादादित्यवंशो निवर्तते (Narasimha-p. 22.15), [Budha is either to be corrected to Buddha or to be taken as a name of Buddha; see सर्वज्ञः सुगतो बुधः (Vyādi, quoted in the Vyākhyā-sudhā comm. on Amara 1.1.13).] Narasimha-p. 26.12 shows the same order replacing Vastrapāṇi by Astrapāṇi. The Viṣṇu-p. mentions Śuddhodana and Rāhula but not Buddha in its chapter on genealogy (4.22). As Buddha abandoned kingship his name was not mentioned in the genealogical list. The Kalki-p. speaks of Śuddhodana as the brother of Jina, king of the Kikāṭa country (2. 7.28).

16. Buddha himself declared that the name of his father was शुद्धोदन (Mahāpadāna-suttānta in Dīghanikāya).
17. बुद्धो नामाजनसुतः (Bhāg. 1.3.24); अजनस्य सुतः । जिनसुत इति पाठे जिनोऽपि स एव (comm. Bhāvarthadīpikā); जिनस्य सुतो भविष्यति नाम्ना बुद्धः (comm. Bhāgavatacandrikā); अजनसुतः, अजिनसुतश्चेति पाठद्वयम् (comm. Sārāthadarśinī); अजिनस्य सुतो नाम्ना बुद्धः (Siddhānta-pradīpa). मोहनार्थं दानवानां बालरूपी पथि स्थितः । पुत्रं तं कल्पयामास मूढबुद्धिर्जिनः स्वयम् ॥ (Brahmaṇḍa quoted in the comm. Bhāgavatatātparyā by Madhva on Bhāg. 1.3.24) बौद्धरूपः स्वयं जातः कलौ प्राप्ते भयानके । अजिनस्य द्विजस्यैव सुतो भूत्वा जनार्दनः ॥ (Bhaviṣya-p. 4. 12.27). It is to be noted here that the Purāṇa says (in the verse 28) that Buddha appeared in the Tāmasāntara (in the Tāmasa, i. e. the fourth manvantara). The significance of this assertion is difficult to understand. The Kalki-p. has a peculiar view about both Jina and Śuddhodana in 2.6-7. It says that Kalki came to the Kikāṭa country to chastise Buddha and he met with Jina, king of the country and Śuddhodana, his brother, both of whom were killed by Kalki.
18. "And the name of her [Buddha's Mother's] father is expressly given as Añjana, the Śakiyan" (Rhys Davids : Buddhist India, p. 18).

the Purāṇas) cannot be determined unless proper critical editions of the Purāṇas are prepared.

Since Kalki-p. 2.7.44 regards मायादेवी as the mother of the Buddhists (मातरं बौद्धाः) we may reasonably infer that Māyādevī is the name of Buddha's mother. Buddha himself declared that the name of his mother was Māyādevī (Mahāpadāna-suttānta). Buddhist tradition and the lexicons (Amarakośa 1.1.15) are in favour of this view.¹⁹ A mythical form of Māyādevī is found in Kalki-p. 2. 7. 36-44.

It may be surmised that अञ्जनी is also the name of 'Buddha's mother from the statement मगधे हेमसदनाद् अञ्जन्यां प्रभविव्यति विणोरंशो जगत्पाता बुधः (in Kumārika-khaṇḍa 40.255-256). If we take बुध as the same as बुद्ध, अञ्जनी cannot but be the name of Buddha's mother as there is no country of this name. For a discussion on this statement see *infra*.

There is no mention of Buddha's wife in the Purāṇas²⁰ and we find no direct statement regarding the son of Buddha in the Purāṇas. The Viṣṇupurāṇa says that Śuddhodana was succeeded by Rāhula (4.22.3),²¹ and from Buddhistic works we find that Rāhula was the son of Buddha. It may be presumed that since Buddha took *sannyāsa* before being enthroned,²² Rāhula is said to have succeeded his grandfather Śuddhodana.

19 "The name of his [Buddha's] mother has not yet been found in the oldest texts, but it is given in the Buddha-vaṃśa as Māyā" (Rhys Davids: The History and Literature of Buddhism, p. 60).

20. It appears that the Purāṇic authors had no occasion to mention the name of the wife of Buddha.

21. तस्मात् शाक्यः, शाक्यात् शुद्धोदनः, तस्मात् राहुलः, ततः प्रसनेजित् (Viṣṇu-p. 4.22.3). The readings शुद्धोदन and राहुल in the place of शुद्धोदन and राहुल (as found in some editions) are corrupt.

22. A Varāha-p. verse says that Buddha enjoyed kingship : शुद्धोदनस्य बुद्धोद्भूत स्वयं पुत्रो जमादनः । मुक्त्वा राज्यस्त्रियं सोऽयं गतिं परमकां गतः ॥ (quoted in Kṛtyaratnākara, p. 247). This is however extremely doubtful. If 'मुक्त्वा राज्यस्त्रियम्' means 'Buddha's remaining in the royal palace for some years' (before leaving it for ever with a view to discovering the way of getting rid of all miseries) then the Purāṇic statement may be accepted as valid.

The body of Buddha

We have a few statements describing the body and the limbs of Buddha. The expression *devasundara-rūpa* in Matsya-p. 47. 217 (देवसुन्दररूपेण बुद्धो जज्ञे)²³ shows the exquisite beauty of Buddha. He is said to be of white or pale-red complexion²⁴ and लम्बकर्ण (possessing long ears) in Angi-p.49.8; मुण्डित²⁵ (of shaven head) and शुक्लदन्तवान्²⁶ (having white teeth) in Śānti-p.348.41-42 (Kum. ed.) The epithet अम्बरावृत in Agni-p.49.8 shows that Buddha, unlike Mahāvīra, used to put on cloth on his body.

The language used by Buddha

It is the Mahābhārata that informs us that Buddha preached his views through the medium of the Māgadhī language (भाषया मागधेनैव धर्मराजगृहे वसन्, Śānti-p.348.41; cr. ed. App. 1, no. 31). (Gramatically मागधेन भाषया is wrong; it ought to be corrected to मागध्या; the corrected reading however renders the metre defective).

-
23. It has however variant readings. "In the readings recorded in the Anandasrama edn. the line देवसुन्दररूपेण द्वैपायनपुरःसरः" is given two variants, one making it more intelligible in its application to the Buddha : देवतासुररूपेण and another introducing the missing Kṛṣṇa दे. कयां.... वसुदेवेन. The bulk of the MSS of Matsya collated by us have the reading देवक्यां वसुदेवेन. Further MSS, though not all of them,....read विधौ नवमके, thus eliminating the Buddha altogether" (Dr. V. Raghavan : 'Further Gleanings from the Matsya-p.', in Purāṇa III, p. 324).
24. In the Majjhimanikāya Buddha is found to have declared that the beauty of his pale-red body was destroyed on account of his practising acute austerities before the attainment of bodhi.
25. Cp. Brhatsaṃhitā-57.44 which describes Buddha as सुनीचकेश (57.44) meaning अत्यल्पकेश; its variant सुनीतकेश means अतिनियमितकेश.
26. Nilakaṇṭha remarks शुक्लदन्ता मांसाशनत्यागाद् अन्यथा रक्तदन्तत्वं स्यात् (on Hariv. 3.3.15). The significance as shown here does not seem to be satisfactory.

The aforesaid assertion about the language used by Buddha is historically valid. It is to be noted that (i) Pali was the language of Magadha through which Buddha preached and that (ii) Pali, on account of being spoken in Magadha was called Māgadhi. In time of Buddha Pali (the language of Buddha's sayings) and Māgadhi were synonymous. Afterwards the language of the religious teachings was called Pali and the Prākṛta language current at that time came to be called Māgadhi.²⁷

It is well known that the Māgadhi language was highly praised by Buddhist teachers. In several works on Pali grammar Māgadhi is extolled by the couplet : सा भागधी मूलभासा नरा ययादिक-
पिका । ब्रह्माणो चस् सुतालापा संबुद्धा चापि भासरे ॥ cp. the statement
मागधभासाक्खरेण लिखाहि (सरसनवंस, p. 31, P. T. Series). Since Buddha
used Māgadhi the Buddhist teachers spoke of it in a highly exaggerated way.²⁸

27. In later period Pali ceased to be the spoken language and it existed in religious works only. This later Māgadhi (which in reality is the gradually developed form of Pali) better known as the Māgadhi Prākṛta (Māgadhi Apabhraṃśa) and sometimes called Māgadhinirukta (Datha-varṇa 1.10) is the direct source of Oriya, Maithili, Bengali, Asamese, etc. The Māgadhi in the Sanskrit plays is quite different from Pali. It is better to use बौद्ध-मागधी for Pali and प्राकृतमागधी for मागधी प्राकृत(भाषा). Ardhamāgadhi is, however, a mixture of प्राकृत मागधी and महाराष्ट्री (Saṃkṣipta-sāra-vyākaraṇa 5.98).

28. "It is claimed by Buddhaghosa, the greatest known Pali commentator, that the language through the medium of which the Buddha promulgated his doctrine and discipline was Māgadhi. To Buddhaghosa as well as to other Pali commentators Māgadhi is indeed the nirukti or diction of what is known as the Pali canon" (B. M. Barua : Some Aspects of Early Buddhism, in 'Cultural Heritage of India, Vol I, p. 442). "Even Buddhaghosa says that a child brought up without hearing the human voice would instinctively speak Māgadhi" (R. Childers : A Dictionary of the Pali language, p. 13), *vide* the comm. on the Mahārūpa-siddhi, p. 27.

Activities of Buddha

The Purāṇas ascribe two kinds of activities to Buddha, namely (1) preaching views in order to delude demons etc.²⁰ and (2) blaming animal sacrifice as prescribed in the Vedas.⁸⁰

Following points are to be noted in this connection. The beings deluded by Buddha were rarely called men; chiefly they were called *daityas*, *dānavas* and *asuras*. These words seem to signify 'human beings possessing the characteristics of *daityas* etc', It would be illogical to assume that *daityas* etc. are to be taken in their Purāṇic sense i. e. 'the offspring of Diti' etc. The metaphorical use of these words is often found in the Purāṇas.

29. मोहनाय सुरद्विषाम् (Bhāg. 1.3.24; Garuḍa-p. 1.1.32). नमो बुद्धाय च दैत्यमोहिने (Bhāg. 10.40.22). दैत्यानां नाशनार्थाय विष्णुना बुद्धरूपिणा । बौद्धशास्त्रमसत् प्रोक्तम् (Padma-p. 6.263. 69-70). नमोऽस्तु बुद्धाय च दैत्यमोहिने (Padma, Sṛṣṭi 73.93). बुद्धो मोहयिष्यामि मानवान् (Śānti-p. 348. 42 Kum. ed.). मायामोहस्वरूपोऽसौ मोहयामास दैत्यांस्तान् त्याजिता वेदधर्मकम् (Agni-p. 16.2-3). तेन बुद्धस्वरूपेण भविष्यति जगत् सर्वं मोहितम् (Skanda, Revā 151.22). छलेन मोहयिष्यामि भूत्वा बुद्धोऽसुरानहम् (Skanda, Vaiṣṇava, Vasudeva-Māhātmya, 18.41; Guru maṇḍala ed.). ततो लोकविमोहाय बुद्धस्त्वं वै भविष्यसि (Bṛ-Dharma-p. 2.11.72).

30. देवद्विषां निगमवर्त्मनि निष्ठितानां बहुभाष्यत औपधर्म्यम् (Bhāg 2.7.37). वादैर्विमोहयति यज्ञकृतोऽतदहन् (Bhāg. 11.4.23) नमस्ते वेदनिन्दाकराय च जैनाय बौद्धरूपाय (Śiva-p 2.5.16.11; बौद्ध to be corrected to बुद्ध, or it is to be taken in the sense of बुद्धसंबन्धिन्; in the preceding vers Kṛṣṇa and Rāma have been extolled). पुनश्च वेदमार्गो नि निन्दितः स्थापितं नास्तिकमतं वेदमार्गविरोधकृत् ॥ (Śiva-p 2.4.9.25). वेदमार्गो विनाशितः (Bhaviṣya-p. 1.6.39). तत् संमोहयामास जिनाद्यानसुरांशकान् । भगवान् वाग्भिस्त्राभिरहिंसावाचिभिर्हरिः ॥ (Brahmāṇḍa-p. quoted in Bhāgavatatātpary by Madhva, 1.3.28). पुनरिह विधिकृत-वेदधर्मानुष्ठानविहितः बुद्धावतारस्त्वमसि (Kalki-p. 2.3.29). वेदवर्त्मप्रवृत्तानामसुराण विमोहनम् । रूपं धृत्वा यज्ञविद्यां हिंसाप्रायां विनिन्द सि ॥ (Purāṇasari hitā 8.81),

Some are of opinion that the use of the words like *daitya*, *dānava*, etc. is in accordance with the Purāṇic character of narrating events of past ages (Buddha lived long before the authors of the current Purāṇas). These words refer to those persons who, in ancient times, followed anti-Vedic religions and consequently found the teachings of Buddha as valid and useful. A similar use of words is found in the legends concerning the destruction or the loss of the Vedas. The Purāṇas say that the Vedas were destroyed or stolen by the *asuras* namely Hayagrīva, Śaṅkha and others.³¹ There is no doubt that in these legends the word *asura* refers to those persons who were against Vedic discipline and who created obstacle to the propagation of Vedic culture. It must be borne in mind that no mythical tale can spring through pure imagination, such tales must have their bases in some form of reality.³²

It is remarkable to note here that in later period followers of the Vedic religion declared that it was love of wanton life that had caused the highly learned persons of the 'Hindu' society to embrace Buddhism (*vide* Nyāyakusumāñjali by Udayana (Ch II) of the 10th century).

From the Purāṇic statements it does not appear that Buddha was against the *nivṛtti-mārga* or *jñāna-mārga* of the Vedas. This is quite in consonance with the teachings of Buddha as found in the Pīṭakas. Buddha is found to praise highly of those sages who were the followers of the *nivṛtti* or *jñāna mārga* of the Vedas³³ (*vide* Brāhmaṇa-dhārmika-sutta in Suttanipāṭa).

31. *Vide* Bhāgavata-p 11.4.17, 5.18.6, Varāha-p 15, 15.10, 11.3.20, Kūrma-p 1.16.77-84, Matsya-p 53.5.7, Padma-p 4.22.33, 6.25.1-31; Agni-p 2.16-17, Śānti-p 347, Vana-p 85.46-48.

32. Cp the historical interpretation of (1) Gayāsura in the 'Buddha-Gayā' by R. L. Mitra and 'Gayā and Buddha Gayā' by B. M. Barua and of (2) Kalki in the papers by (1) K. P. Jayaswal in Indian Antiquary, vol. 46 (1917), by (2) Prof. Pathak in Indian Antiquary, vol. 43 (1918) and by (3) Otto Schrader in Brahmayāyā, vol. I.

33. The Kalki-p. has a statement that precisely states the view-point of Buddha ब्रह्माभासविलासचातुरी प्रकृतिविमाननाम् असपादयन् बुद्धावतारस्त्वमसि (2.3.29). The first two expressions in this statement are highly significant and deserve to be explained elaborately. The statement will be explained in a separate paper on 'The Buddhist religion and philosophy in the Purāṇas'.

Buddha is said to be the killer of Madhu and also dear to Madhu in Skanda-Revā 151.2 (मधुहन्ता मधुप्रियः). Nothing is known about this Madhu and the information is not found in any other Purāṇa. Since Buddha is regarded here as the ninth incarnation, the information creates a problem which is difficult to solve. Is the first Madhu the same as Māra ?

The places associated with Buddha

Following places have been mentioned in the Purāṇas in connection with Buddha.

Kikaṭa—It is said that Buddha will appear in Kikaṭa (बुद्धो नामा...कीकटेषु भविष्यति, Bhāg. 1.3.24; Garuḍa 1.1.32).³⁴ As Kikaṭa is not stated to be the birth place of Buddha in Buddhist works³⁵ we are to take the root *bhū* (in *bhaviṣyati*) in the sense of 'to reside' or 'to lead the life'.³⁶ Thus we can take Kikaṭa as a centre for preaching Buddhism.³⁷ The plural number in the

-
34. कीकटेषु मध्ये गयाप्रदेशे (comm. Bhāvarthadīpikā); कीकटेषु मगधविषयेषु (comm. Padaratnāvali); cp. Sāttvata-Saṁhitā 2 65 (पाषण्डशास्त्रमधिकल्प्य सुरद्विषाणां कर्ता जिनस्य तनयो भगवान् गयायाम्) and Saundarananda 3.15 (स विनीय काशिषु गयेषु बहुजनमथ गिरिव्रजे).
35. But see सो च भगवा मागधो मगधे भवता ... (since Buddha appeared in Magadha, he was called Māgadha), quoted from some Pali text by Pt. Vidhusēkhara Śāstrin in his Pāli-prakāśa, Intro. p. 13, fn. 32.
36. See Kṣīratarāṅgiṇī on the root Bhū (p. 4, ed. by 4. Mīmāṃsaka); in Mbh. Vana-p. 157.45 भविष्यसि means जीविष्यसि (Nīlakaṇṭha).
37. Kikaṭa was deemed so intimately connected with Buddha that the Kalki-p (2.6.40) described Kalki's going to Kikaṭa with an army with a view to chastising Buddha, though Purāṇa tradition declares that Kalki will appear in the future. The Kalki-p. (2.6.41-42) further says that Kikaṭa was the country of the Bauddhas where there was no performance of the Vedic religion. Inhabitants of this country are said to be the followers of materialism and to be antagonistic to the rules of caste etc. It is remarkable to note that in the Ṛgveda (3 53.14) Kikaṭa was regarded as a land beyond the pale of aryanism and in the Nirukta (6.32) as an anārya-nivāsa.

word Kīkaṭa indicates that it is the name of a *janapada*. In the Purāṇas Kīkaṭa has been mentioned in a very few places. According to Garuḍa-p. 1.82.5 Kīkaṭa is situated in Gayā; according to Br. Dharma-p. 2.26 20-22 the Kīkaṭa country has been called an unholy land. its king Kākakaṇṇa is said to be the despiser of the Brahmins and the name of one of its towns is Gayā; according to Vāyu-p. 108.73 the holy Gaṅgā, the holy Rājagṛha-vana and the holy river Punaḥpunā are in the Kīkaṭa country. Thus we can take Kīkaṭa as the ancient name of Magadha, a view supported by the lexicographer Hemacandra (Abhidhānacintāmaṇi).

Magadha—Mentioned in Skanda-Kumārīkā 40.255 (मगधे हेमसदनादङ्गन्यां प्रविष्यति). The significance of Hemasadana is to be determined.³⁸ For a discussion on this statement see below.

Dharmarājagṛha—It is said that Buddha, son of Śuddhodana, will delude men staying in the Dharmarājagṛha by preaching his views through the medium of the Māgadhi language (Śānti-p. 348. 41-42 Kum. ed.). It appears that the Dharmarājagṛha is the same as Rājagṛha.³⁹

That Rājagṛha was intimately connected with the activities of Buddha is a historical fact. It is well known that in Rājagṛha lay the centre of his missionary activities. Buddha is said to have gone out on his first alms-begging in Rājagṛha and to have lived in a cave of a hill in Rājagṛha. In the Dīghanikāya Buddha is said to have described many places of Rājagṛha as 'highly delightful'. It is a pity that schism in the Buddhist order also started at Rājagṛha.

Nepala—In the Nepālā-māhātmya section (1.57-65a) of the Himavat khaṇḍa (which is said to be a part of the Skanda-p. and

38. There are minor Buddhist Schools, most of which seem to be of local origin, namely हेमवत, राजगिरिय (Mahāvamsa 5.12-13). Has this हेमवत any connection with हेमसदन ?

39. It may also be surmised that since Dharmarāja is the name of Buddha, a particular place (in Magadha) was called धर्मराजगृह. As for example Veṇuvana in Rājagṛha was a place which was intimately connected with Buddha. It is however better to accept धर्म (in the sense of धर्मयुक्त) as qualifying राजगृह.

which seems to be a work of much later age) it is said that Buddha, a form of Viṣṇu, came to a hill in Nepal from the Saurāṣṭra country and practised penance. The goddess Girijā (called Vajrayoginī) appeared to Buddha and gave a boon to him to the effect that persons residing in Nepal would be virtuous and that in this country the devotees of both Śiva and Buddha would reside. Being asked by Devī Buddha established a *liṅga* at the confluence of the rivers of Vāgmatī and Maṇimatī.

The aforesaid story does not seem to have any Buddhist basis. It appears that since Buddha was born in Nepalese border and since Buddhist Tantra has a close connection with Nepal, the aforesaid story was conceived by the Purāṇic authors.

Time of Buddha

Three kinds of statements are usually found in the Purāṇas about the time of Buddha. Sometimes the expression *pura*⁴⁰ (in ancient times) is used, which, being vague, does not require any discussion. A good number of Purāṇas declare that Buddha flourished at the beginning⁴¹ or precisely at the first quarter⁴² of the Kaliyuga. This view however is not of much value, if we think that a quarter of Kaliyuga is equal to 108000 years (the Kaliyuga being of 432000 years).

-
40. पुरा देवासुरे युद्धे....शुद्धोदनसुतोऽभवत् (Agri-p. 16.1-2).
41. ततः कलौ सम्प्रवृत्ते....बुद्धो भविष्यामि (Bhāg. 1.3.24; Garuḍa-p. 1.1.32). कलौ प्राप्ते यथा बुद्धो भवेन्नारायणः प्रभुः (Narasimha-p. 36.9). कलियुगे घोरे संप्राप्ते....शुद्धोदनसुतो बुद्धो भविष्यामि (Viṣṇu-dharma, ch. 66; *vide* Studies in the Upapurāṇas, I p. 144). ततः कलियुगस्यादौ....शुद्धोदनसुतो बुद्धो.... (Śānti-p. 348 41-42 Kum. ed.). मया बुद्धेन वक्तव्या घर्माः कलियुगे पुनः (V. Dh. U. 3.351.54).
42. कलेः प्रथमचरणे वेदमार्गो विनाशितः (Bhaviṣya-p. 1.6.39). As the verses preceding to this verse are noteworthy for chronological purposes they are given here : “एतस्मिन्नेव काले तु कलिना संस्मृतो हरिः । काश्यपाद् उद्भवो देवो गौतमो नाम विश्रुतः ॥३६॥ बौद्धधर्मं च संस्कृत पट्टणे प्राप्तवान् हरिः । दश वर्षं कृतं राज्यं तस्माच् छाक्यमुनिः स्मृतः ॥३७॥ विंशद्वर्षं कृतं राज्यं तस्माच् शुद्धोदनोऽभवत् । त्रिंशद्वर्षं कृतं राज्यं शाक्यसिंहस्ततोऽभवत् ॥ ३८ ॥ शतादौ द्विसहस्रेऽब्दे

The third view says that Buddha flourished in the 28th Kaliyuga.⁴³ The Purāṇic reckoning of the subdivisions of a *yuga* is still an enigma and unless the problem is solved it is useless to dwell upon this point.

There is a fourth view found in the Kumārikā-khaṇḍa of the Skanda-p. only. From the verses⁴⁴ (as given in the footnote) it appears that Budha i. e. Buddha appeared 3600 years after the beginning of the Kaliyuga, taking ततः as indicating 'after the beginning of the Kali yuga'. If 3102 B. C. is taken as the beginning of the Kaliyuga, then, according to this view, Buddha appeared after Christ—an absurd view ! The Purāṇic verses as given in the footnote are highly perplexing and one is tempted to take this Buddha as a different person from Siddhārtha Buddha.

व्यतीते सोऽभवन्नुपः । कलेः प्रथमचरणे etc. In some places the printed readings seem to be corrupt. Before 'एतस्मिन्नेव काले तु' the Purāṇa reads महानन्दस्ततो जातः पितुस्तुर्यं कृतं पदम् (35) and it shows the order of the kings from Nanda to Mahānanda as Nanda—Prananda—Parānanda—Samānanda — Priānanda—Devānanda—Yajñabhaṅga—Mauryānanda—Mahānanda (verses 32-35) The above account has its own peculiarities which deserve to be noted carefully. Smith's observations about the chronological position of the Nanda kings are worth noticing: "Many unsuccessful attempts have been made to harmonize the conflicting traditions and to evolve a reasonable scheme of chronology. I cannot pretend to solve the puzzle" (Oxford H. of India p. 83).

- 43 अष्टाविंशतिमे प्राप्ते.....बुद्धो भूत्वा प्रवर्तयत् (Brahma-p. quoted in Kṛtyaratnākara, p. 159).
44. ततः त्रिषु सहस्रेषु षट्शतैरत्रिंशे च । मगधे हेमसदनाद् अञ्जन्यां प्रभविष्यति ॥ २५५ ॥ विष्णोरंशो धर्मपाता बुधः साक्षात् स्वयं प्रभुः । तस्य कर्मणि भूरीणि भविष्यन्ति महात्मनः ॥ २५६ ॥ ज्योतिर्बिन्दुमुल्लानुपान् स हनिष्यति कोटिशः । चतुर्षष्टि च वर्षाणि भुक्त्वा द्वीपानि सप्तच । सक्तेभ्यः स्वयंशो भुक्त्वा दिवः पञ्चाद् गमिष्यति ॥ २५७ ॥ सर्वेषां चावताराणां गुणैः समविको यतः ॥ २५८ ॥ ततो वक्ष्यन्ति तं भक्त्या सर्वपापहरं बुधम् ॥ २५९ क । (40.255-259a). In lexicons Budha is read as a synonym of Buddha; सर्वज्ञः सुगतो बुधः (Vyādi quoted in Vyākhyasudhā on Amara 1.1.13).

Following points are to be noted in this connection : (i) This Buddha lived for 64 years, while Siddhārtha Budha lived for 80 years; (ii) this Buddha killed some persons, while Siddhārtha was a strict follower of non-violence; (iii) this Buddha is regarded as धर्मपाता, while Siddhārtha has never been regarded as such by the Paurāṇikas (dharma being the same as the Vedic religion). In spite of these glaring differences we find some points of essential similarity, namely his connection with the Magadha country (verse 255) and his being a part of Viṣṇu (verse 250).

It is to be further noted that in this passage the indication of time concerning Buddha is ambiguous. The word ततः in verse 255 does not necessarily mean 'after the beginning of the Kali age; it may easily be taken to mean 3600 years after the Śaka king' ! The relevant verses are given in the footnote^{4 5}; they may be considered by interested readers with a view to deriving a plausible sense. At present we are unable to give any rational explanation of these verses.^{4 5}

- 45 अष्टाविंशे कलौ यच्च भावि तत्त्वं निबोध मे ॥२४८॥ त्रिषु वर्षसहस्रेषु कले
यतिषु पार्थिव । त्रिशतेषु दशान्यूनेष्वस्यां भुवि भविष्यति ॥२४९॥ शूद्रको
नाम वीराणामधिपः सिद्धिमत्र सः । चर्चितायां समाराध्य लप्स्यते भूभरा-
पहः ॥२५०॥ ततस्त्रिषु सहस्रेषु दशाधिकशतत्रये । भविष्यं नन्दराज्यं च
चाणक्यो यान् हनिष्यति ॥२५१॥ शुक्लतीर्थे सर्वपापनिर्मुक्तिं योऽभिलप्-
स्यति । ततस् त्रिषु सहस्रेषु विंशत्या चाधिकेषु च ॥२५२॥ भविष्यं विक्रमा-
दित्यराज्यं सोऽयं प्रलप्स्यते । सिद्धिप्रसादाद् दुर्गाणां दीनान् यो ह्यद्-
वरिष्यति ॥२५३॥ ततः शतसहस्रेषु शतेनाप्यधिकेषु च । शको नाम
भविष्यन्न योऽतिदारिद्र्यहारकः ॥२५४॥ (Kumārikā ch : 40); verses
255-259a quoted above are about Budha or Buddha.
46. I have come to know of the following verse on Buddha
from some Vaiṣṇavas of the Gaudīya school, which says
that Buddha appeared 2000 years after the beginning of
the Kaliyage : असौ व्यक्तः कलेरब्दसहस्रद्वितये गते । मूर्तिः पाटलवर्णस्य
द्विभुजश्चिकुरोज्झितः ॥ (pātata=of pale-red or pink colour;
cikurojjhita means the same as muṇḍita). If Buddha
was born in 624 BC or 563 BC (according to the Buddhist
traditions current in different countries), it follows that
he was born 2478 or 2539 years after the Kali era. If we
read the verse as अर्धसहस्रद्वितये and take it to mean 2500
(500+2000) years, the date as given here tallies with the

Tithi and week-day concerning the birth of Buddha

No Purāṇa says anything on these two points. It is the Purāṇa-samuccaya (which is relied upon simply because it bears the word purāṇa in its name; quoted in Nirṇayasindhu, p. 61) that says that Buddha was born in the 6th day of the bright half in the month of Āśvina (कृष्णोऽष्टम्यां नभसि सितपरे चाश्विने यद् दशम्यां बुद्धः कल्की नभसि समभवत् छुक्लष्ट्यां क्रमेण.⁴⁷ According to Buddhist tradition Siddhārtha Buddha was born in the 15th day of the bright-half (pūrṇimā) of the month of Vaiśākha.

Worship of Buddha

Only a few statements are found about the worship of Buddha. Varāha-p. 48.22 informs us that one desirous of beauty should worship Buddha (रूपकामो यजेद् बुद्धम्).

In the procedure of the Śravaṇadvādaśī-vrata Buddha is mentioned : कृष्णनाम्ना च नेत्रे द्वे बुद्धनाम्ना तथा शिरः (Saura-p. 15.16; by uttering the name of Buddha the head of the deity to be worshipped is to be touched); similarly Buddha's name is mentioned in the procedure of the Nakṣatrapuruṣa-vrata in Matsya-p ch. 54 बुद्धाय शान्ताय नमो ललाटं चित्रासु संपूजयत्तमं मुरारेः, 54.19). The Varāha-p. has a chapter on the Buddhadvādaśī-vrata (ch. 47). According to Bhaviṣya (Uttara 4.140) lamps are to be lighted in the temple of Siddhārtha Buddha, Brāhmā and others. In Garuḍa-p. I. 196.11 it is remarked that Buddha is to be invoked for protection from the *pāṇḍas* (बुद्धः पाण्डसंघातात् अवतु). A similar view is found in the procedure of Nārāyaṇa-varman (बुद्धस्तु पाण्डगणप्रसादात्) in Bhāgavata- p. 6. 8. 19.

two dates stated above. It is well known that different Buddhist traditions give different dates for Buddha, placing him in 1332 BC, in about 1000, 2959 or 835 BC. (Wilson : Asiatic Researches, vol. XV. p. 92).

47. Cp. आषाढे शुक्लनवमी विशाखायां च भास्करे । दिवा नाडीयट्कमच्ये बुद्धोऽभूदंशजो हरेः ॥ (Svatantra-tantra quoted in Prāṇato-siṁhī, p. 373).

Cp. also 'Māyādevī was delivered of Bodhisattva or the child on the fifteenth day of the fourth moon of the Wood-Rat year' (A. C. Korosi : The Life and Teachings of Buddha, p. 27). The last part of the sentence is not quite intelligible.

The Kṛtyaratnākara (pp. 159-160) quotes a passage from the Brahma-p. about a *vrata* on the śukla-saptami in the month of Vaiśākha, where it is stated that at the seventh day of Vaiśākha when the moon, associated with the Puṣya constellation, shines, the image of Buddha should be bathed and gifts, garments, etc. should be given to śākya-bhikṣus. The worship of the golden image of Buddha is prescribed in the Varāha-purāṇa (quoted in the Kṛtyaratnākara, p. 247).

In connection with the worship of Buddha it is necessary to show here the Purāṇic outlook about the Aśvatha tree, under one of which Siddhārtha is said to have attained *bodhi* or *lokottara jñāna*.⁴⁸ (*vide* Mahāpadāna-Suttāntā in Dīghanikāya). Even non-Buddhist scholars are found to opine that the aśvattha-tree came to be called *bodhidruma* on account of Siddhārtha's having acquired *bodhi* under it (अस्य मूले भगवता बुद्धेन बोधिः साक्षात्कृत इति साहचर्याद् वृक्षोऽपि बोधिः, comm. Trikaṇḍacintāmaṇi on Amarakośa 2.4.20-21). The verses quoted in the foot note will show how this tree was looked with reverence by the authors of the Purāṇas⁴⁹.

Purassara of Buddha

Matsya-p. 47.247 informs us that Buddha, whose *purassara* was Dvaipāyana, was born as the ninth incarnation (बुद्धो नवमको जज्ञे... द्वैपायनपुरस्सरः). The word *purassara* means '*purogāmin*' (going in front, a fore-runner; it may also mean a teacher, a *purohita*). It is however extremely difficult to conceive Dvaipāyana (whether it means the sage Veda-vyāsa or it means any person born in an

48. "Every Buddha is supposed to have attained enlightenment under a tree. The tree differs in the accounts of each of them. Our Buddha's wisdom tree, for instance, is of the kind called the Assattha or Pippal tree" (Rhys Davids : Buddhist India, p. 229-230).

49. चलदलाय वृक्षाय सदा विष्णुस्थिताय च । बोधिसत्त्वाय योग्याय सदाश्रित्य नमोऽस्तुते ॥ (Padma-p. 5.55-16). चलद्दलाय वृक्षाय सर्वदा चलयिष्ये । बोधिसत्त्वाय यज्ञाय अश्रित्याय नमो नमः ॥ (Vāyu-p. quoted in Tristhali-setu, p. 361). नमस्तैऽश्रित्यरूपाय ब्रह्मविष्णु-शिवात्मने । बोधिद्रुमाय कर्तृणां पितृणां तारणाय च ॥ (Vāyu-p. 111. 27). तस्मादिमौ विष्णुमहेश्वरावुभौ बभूवुः । बोधिवटौ मुनीश्वराः (Padma-p. 6.117.30).

island) as a *purāṣara* (in any one of its senses) of Buddha. The difficulty, however, is got over if we consider that "the Vāyu-p., whose ch. 98 corresponds exactly to the latter part of this chapter (47th) of Matsya, omits the Buddha altogether and reads instead several verses on Kṛṣṇa."⁵⁰ It is however to be noted that the idea of 'a fore-runner of Śākya Buddha' is found in Buddhist tradition.⁵¹

Śākya in connection with Buddha

The Purāṇas sometime use the word *śākya* in connection with Buddha. In शाक्यबुद्धोपजीविनः (Brahmāṇḍa-p. 2.31.60; Brahma-p. 230.13) *śākya* is an adjective to Buddha.⁵² Sometimes the word is used in the sense of 'a follower of Buddha' as is found in the Brahma-vaivarta passage बौद्धं धर्मं समास्थाय शाक्यास्ते वै बभूवुरे (quoted in Śrāddha-kāṇḍa by Hemādri, p. 3).

According to the Matsya-p. 271.72 and Viṣṇu-p. 4.22.3 *śākya* is the name of the grand-father of Buddha. This seems to be highly doubtful as we do not find any corroborative statement in Buddhist works. The Br. Vaivarta-p. (quoted in Tantrādhikārinīyaya, pp. 2-3) derives *Śākya* from the root *śak* (to be able) in the sense of 'capable of subduing the gods' (said to the *asuras* by Buddha) — a derivation which is highly fanciful. The word has been explained in various ways⁵³ the authoritativeness of which does not seem

50. Vide 'Further Gleanings from the Matsya-p.' in Purāṇa III p. 324.

51. Buddhist tradition speaks of 24 predecessors of Siddārtha Buddha, the last of whom was Kaśyapa; cp. काश्यपाद् उद्भवो देवो गौतमो नाम नामतः (Bhāviśya-p. III.1.6.36). Siddārtha Buddha, in turn, is the predecessor of Maitreya Buddha, who will appear afterwards.

52. In a passage in the Āgneya-p. similar to that in the Brahmāṇḍa and the Brahmapurāṇa we read 'शाक्यो बुद्धोपजीविनः' (vide 'St. Up.' I, p. 145). It appears that the meaning of the word *śākya* gradually became obscure.

53. शाक्यमुनिर्बुद्धावतारः, शाकोऽभिजनोऽस्येति शुण्डिकादिभ्यो ज्यः (Aṣṭa. 4.3.92) (Kṣīrasvāmin on Amarakośa 1.1.14). शाकेषु भवो विद्यमानो वा दिगादित्वाद् यत् (Trikāṇḍacintāmaṇi on Amara). शाकवृक्षप्रतिच्छन्नं वासं यस्माच्च चक्रिरे । तस्मादिच्छाकुर्वन्त्यास्तं भुवि

to be out of question. The word Śākya-muni for Buddha is fairly old, for it is found in the Rummindei inscription of Aśoka.

Before concluding this article we want to inform our readers that about the Buddhist philosophy and religion the Purāṇas contain various statements—almost all of which blame, denounce or decry them vehemently. Buddhist doctrines as propounded in the Purāṇas (sometimes with the names of the Buddhistic schools) have their own importance and they deserve to be compared with the doctrines found in the Buddhist philosophical works. In a separate paper we shall deal elaborately with the Buddhist religion and philosophy as described in the Purāṇas.

It should be noted in this connection that in the Purāṇas the words Jina, Jinadharma, Buddha-sāstra, Bauddha dharma and the like do not always bear the same sense. Sometimes Bauddha or Jaina means any anti-Vedic doctrine, whether it was taught by Siddhārtha Buddha or by a person anterior to him. There are other problems too. Since all the Purāṇic statements do not regard Buddha as an incarnation of the Viṣṇu, the question 'when Siddhārtha Buddha came to be regarded as an incarnation' is of prime importance and it deserves to be solved properly. We shall try to solve these questions in the aforesaid paper.

शाक्या इति स्मृताः ॥ (Saundarananda 1.24). In fact Śākya is the name of a Kṣatriya clan. Buddha himself declared that he had belonged to the Śākya clan (Pabajjā-sutta in Suttanipāṭa; *vide* also Nālaka-sutta in Suttanipāṭa). There are scholars who think that Śākya is based on the Pali word Śākiya (J. R. A. S. 1806, p. 162 ff.). The origin of the name appears to be shrouded in mystery.

BOOK—REVIEW

Mohd. Ismail Khan : BRAHMĀ IN THE PURĀNAS—Crescent Publishing House, F/D-56 New Kavinagar, Ghaziabad; pp. 138 along with 30 photo-plates. Rs. 90/-;

It is gratifying to learn that the book under review has come from the pen of a non-Hindu scholar, who is well known for his love for Sanskrit learning, especially for Purāṇic studies. His dissertation on Sarasvatī has already proved his competence in the field of Purāṇic research. The observations of the author (in the Preface) that 'there is a singularity in the emersion and development of Brahmā' and 'Brahmā has been a neglected deity in the sense that there is a great paucity of literature on him' are without any exaggeration and we have no hesitation in declaring that the author has made a commendable effort in presenting various aspect of Brahmā. His discussions on the physical aspects of Brahmā and Sarasvatī and especially on the implications of the vehicles (*vāhanas*) etc. of these deities are highly interesting. I believe that the work will attract the notice of all lovers of Purāṇic literature.

In its five chapters the book chiefly deals with (1) the position of Brahmā; (2) the birth and death of Brahmā; (3) the offspring and the types of creation of Brahmā; (4) the colour and vehicles of Brahmā; and (5) the image of Brahmā and Sarasvatī, and the objects held in the hands by these deities.

A glance of the book would reveal that the work is not exhaustive and many essential Purāṇic facts concerning Brahmā are wanting. It is not understood why the author has not utilized all the Purāṇas. He does not seem to have collected materials from the Varāha, Nāradya, Liṅga and Kūrma Purāṇas. Again, though he has utilized the Viṣṇuśarmottara and Devībhāgavata (both are Upapurāṇas), yet he has left the Śiva, Devī and Kālīka Upapurāṇas. Since the author has chosen only one deity

for his monograph he should have utilized at least all the Purāṇas (if not the Upapurāṇas), for each of these works has something important to say about Brahmā. As for example Kūrma-p. 1.2. 104 says that those who take recourse to Brahmā should bear the mark *tilaka* on the forehead.

The author has collected a good number of names of Brahmā from eight Purāṇas without giving any explanations. Though most of the names are easily intelligible, yet a few significant names, such as Piṅgala-locana, Śikhin, Viriñci or Virañci, Kuśa-dvaja should have been explained in the light of the Purāṇic material. The etymologies of the names of Brahmā as given in the Purāṇas (*vide* Vāyu-p. 5. 31-46) must have been critically studied by the author. I may inform here the learned author that highly significant names of Brahmā are found in the lexicons also, and these have been explained by the commentators with the help of the Purāṇas. In a few places necessary references have not been given. The reference to the Purāṇic view that 'Brahmā on account of possessing some particular powers is called Karma-Brahmā' (p. 6), should have been given. Similarly the stanza 'Itihāsa-purāṇabhyām....' has been quoted on p. 5 without mentioning the source. Had the author knew the source of this stanza (i. e. Mbh. Ādi-p. 1.267-68) the reading of the verse (as printed) would not have been so corrupt.

A few omissions and faults as found in this work are shown here so that the author may make necessary changes in the second edition :

(1) In the enumeration of the eighteen Purāṇas (pp. 1-2) the name of the Brahma-purāṇa which is read in the first place in the 'Purāṇa-lists' in the Purāṇas, is wanting. (2) There is a mistake in the names of the two subdivisions of the *vaikṛtasarga*; the proper names are *ūrdhvasarga* and *aroāksarga* and not *devasarga* and *manuṣyasarga* as the author thinks (p. 11). (3) The exact name of Vācaspati's comm. on the Sāṃkhyakārikā is Tattva-kaumudī (though often it is called Sāṃkhyatattvakaumudī) (*vide* the benedictory verse at the end of the comm.) and not Sāṃkhyattvakau nudi prabhā as has been written on p. 14. (4) The use of the word *aṅgula* in the sense of a particular measure (p. 105)

is wrong. The correct form is *aṅguli*, which when used as the final member of a Tatpuruṣa compound becomes *aṅgula*, vide Pāṇini 5. 4.86. This wrong use is found almost in all works of modern scholars; it occurs even in the magnum opus of Dr. P.K. Acharya (quoted in the present work on p. 105) and in the Sanskrit-English Dic. by Apte. Maruta for Marut (p. 24) and Anudruhyu for Anu (a son of king Yayati) (p. 46) seem to be the result of inadvertence. Examples of inadvertence are found in many places. In *śuklāśuklamataḥ* (p. 78) *ataḥ* has no relevance, it being an indeclinable. (5) The use of both the stem forms (*prātipadikas*) and the word forms (*padas*) in one and the same work is highly objectionable. It is needless to give examples. Sometimes the form used by the author is neither a stem nor a word; see the word *Durvāsā* on p. 65. It should be either *Durvāsas* (stem form) or *Durvāsāḥ* (word form). (6) It is painful to note that the author has not strictly followed the rules of transliteration. Sometimes the same Sanskrit word has been written in two different ways. It is not understood the usefulness of using the sign of interjection (!) at the end of the first and second halves of a stanza. The modern practice of using straight lines seems to be better.

In conclusion we want to draw the attention of the author to the fact that a monograph on a deity must contain a discussion on the *tīrthas* associated with it and we request the author to append such a list in the Appendix in the second edition of his work; lists of *tīrthas* associated with Brahmā are rarely found; such a list occurs in the Prabhāsakhaṇḍa of the Skandapurāṇa (Ch. 107). A comprehensive list of the temples of Brahmā would have surely enhanced the value of the work. Many interesting facts are usually connected with the temples; as for example in the temple at Konkan Brahmā is worshipped in the form of his foot-prints; vide Mirasi's 'Studies in Indology' II, p. 13.

The price (Rs. 90/-) of the book will certainly come in the way of its brisk sale.

—R. S. B.

SOME GRAPHICAL PURĀṆIC TEXTS ON BRAHMĀ

Author and publisher as above : pages 142 alongwith 16 Photo-plates (8 of Brahmā and 8 of Sarasvatī). Rs. 70/-;

The book contains Purāṇic passages on Brahmā from the Padma, Brahma-vaivarta, Kūrma, Matsya, Viṣṇudharmottara, Vāmana, Brahma and Agni Purāṇas. The collection is, in no sense, exhaustive; as e. g. the author has collected passages from the fifth khaṇḍa of the Padma-p. and not from the other khaṇḍas.

In the Introduction the author has briefly dealt with (1) the epithets of Brahmā, (2) the Purāṇic episode of Brahmā, (3) vehicle of Brahmā, (4) colour of Brahmā, (5) offspring of Brahmā, (6) birth and death of Brahmā, (7) Brahmā as the guardian deity of the Rājasa Purāṇas, (8) the image of Brahmā, (9) various symbols of Brahmā, (10) Brahmā and Sarasvatī, (11) images of Brahmā at various places. Since the Introduction (which is based on the Purāṇic passages collected in this work) is a brief summary of the work reviewed above, no separate review of this book is needed.

It would have been highly useful had the author given at the beginning of the Purāṇic passages brief descriptions of topics which are dealt with in those Purāṇic passages. A work like this must contain a 'subject index' which may be given in the second edition.

—R. S. B.

Frank WHALING, *The Rise of the Religious Significance of Rama*, With the Foreword by E. G. Parrinder and the Preface by D. H. H. Ingalls, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, Varanasi, Patna, 1980 pp. XVIII, 392, Price Rs. 100.

The book traces the rise of the religious significance of the figure of Rāma in North India by examining three important texts : the Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa, the Adhyātma Rāmāyaṇa of the Medieval Period and the Rāmacaritamānasa of Tulsī Das of XVII Cent. A. D. These texts have been chosen because they constitute the main works in the development of the importance of Rāma. The author has used three methods to examine these three texts : the

literary/historical, the symbolical, and the theological. The result is that the figure of Rāma is examined in all its aspects as man, husband, king, hero, *avatāra* of Viṣṇu and in its continuity with Indra, as Brahman and finally as Devotional Lord.

Dr Whaling, who lived in North India from 1962 to 1966, tackles the study of the Rāmāyaṇa-s from the point of view of the Comparative Religionist. His knowledge both of the Rāma tradition and of the Christian tradition is deep and well documented; his style is pleasant and attractive. The Appendix gives rich suggestions for comparison between Rāma, Christ and Kṛṣṇa. The author remarks that the usual confrontation between Christ on the one side and Rāma-Kṛṣṇa on the other does not justify the many situations in which Christ and Rāma stand commonly *versus* Kṛṣṇa or in which Kṛṣṇa and Christ are both counterparts of Rāma. The reader will find in this book several new suggestions for further research. The work is a deep contribution towards understanding the figure of Rāma and a help in religious dialogue. Basic is Dr. Whaling's intuition, substantiated with many convincing proofs throughout the book, that the Rāma of Vālmīki contains in germ all the later developments, which in turn only manifest the seeds already present in the original figure.

The appendix is particularly important for religious dialogue. It would have been interesting if more attention had been given to the different ways of understanding the role of "religious community" in different religions, and to the role of a "name", the *mūrti* and the importance of sacraments. Even the concept of *bhakti* should have been discussed in more depth according to the different religious currents compared.

Both the student of Rāma and the Comparative Religionist, as well as the common reader will be delighted in reading this book which is full of insights and well documented. The bibliography is abundant. It would be advisable to add two more books which deserve particular attention: V. Raghavan, *The Greater Rāmāyaṇa*, All-India Kashiraj Trust, Varanasi, 1973 and Karpatri, *Rāmāyaṇa Mīmāṃsā*, Vārāṇasī, 1979.

The author and the editor are to be congratulated on giving a new tool toward the better understanding of the living Religious traditions of the world.

—G. Bonazzoli

DIANA L. ECK, *Banāras-City of Light*, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1982, pp. XVI, 427, 59 Illustrations; 7 Maps. Price \$ 25.00

Of the many books already written and presently being compiled on Vārāṇasī, Diana L. Eck's is surely the most fascinating. The author displays a rare capacity of understanding the secrets of this magic town, which is so far from her own culture and feelings. The love and admiration for "Kāśī" which surely must have been present in the author while composing the book, are transmitted to the reader through a splendid and captivating style and, equally important, through a solid acquaintance with the wide range of sources, even the lesser known and the less frequently used. The reader is impressed immediately from the very first page. He is taken on a unique tour along the streets and the river-bank, and into the temples and small lanes to perceive and experience the palpitating life of the city of Śiva.

'The book', says the author, 'is a study and interpretation of Banāras from the stand point of one who is close enough to Hindu tradition to see its religious significance and close enough to western religious and academic traditions to know the problems of understanding that Banāras and the Hindu tradition it represents might pose. My work is based on two primary sources : a voluminous literature of Sanskrit texts which describe and praise Banāras, and the city itself, with its patterns of temples, its seasons of pilgrimage, and its priestly and lay interpreters. It is a study of 'text and context' or perhaps more accurately, of classical Sanskrit texts and the 'text' of the city' (pp. XIII-XIV).

After an introduction of the previous works written on Vārāṇasī and a history of the different names of the town, the book continues with a good presentation of the history of Vārāṇasī. The reader is then taken into the religious geography of the city. With the author and the 'text' he admires and praises every sacred spot and every lane. Slowly and thoroughly he begins to understand that the town is built in the shape of a mystical *maṇḍala* with its centre being the temple of Viśvanātha, from which it expands in ever increasing concentric circles. As the revelation continues the town transcends its physical geography and one discovers that it is more than just its *tīrtha*-s or *ghāṭ*s, or temples, but that also

Vārāṇasī, or Kāśī, is the actual or symbolic embodiment of Wisdom, it is *Brahman*, it is *Ātman*, and at the same time it is the city of *kāma*, of *artha*, of *dharma* and of *mokṣa* as well.

The appendices give the Sanskrit sources for the study of Banāras, the zones of the Sacred City, the *Śivaliṅga*-s of Kāśī, the cycles of Kāśī Goddesses, other Deities of Kāśī, and 'the Year in Banāras : A Partial Calendar'.

The Bibliography is quite rich, though a few important sources could be added such as A. S. Altekar, *History of Benares*, Benares 1937; A. K. Narain-T. N. Roy, *Excavations at Rajghat (1957-1958; 1960-1965)*, Varanasi, B. H. U., 1976; *Benares and its Ghats*, Published by the Kashi Tirtha Sudhar Trust, Benares, Allahabad, 1931 and R. L. Singh, *Banaras : A Study in Urban Geography*.

The diacritical marks of the Sanskrit words have been reduced purposely 'so that this text will not be unnecessarily cumbersome to read' (p. 367). However, the name of the town in the title is spelled according to the old fashion 'Banāras', although it is now Vārāṇasī and even before restoration of this name, it was already spelled 'Benares'. Nowhere does the author explain the reason for this choice.

The book is recommendable both to the scholar and to the general reader and deserves attentive reading. The author merits much praise for producing such a book. It is hoped that Diana L. Eck will continue her research and produce similar works of the same exceptional quality.

—G. Bonazzoli

सरिता हांडा, अग्निपुराण की दार्शनिक एवं आयुर्वेदिक सामग्री का अध्ययन, ज्योतिरालोक प्रकाशन, वाराणसी, 1982, pp. XXX, 479. Price Rs. 100/-

From among the many topics which could be chosen for research from the encyclopaedic Agni purāṇa, Dr (MS) Sarita Handa has selected the ayurvedic material, one of the least considered subjects. The book is divided into two parts and deals with both philosophical and ayurvedic matters, but it is the latter which is

given special attention. This book, along with other works on the Garuḍa and Viṣṇudharmottara purāṇa-s, carried on under the illuminating direction of Prof. Jyotir Mitra, enhances greatly our knowledge of ayurvedic science from the medieval period. The Aṣṭāṅga Saṁgraha by Vāgbhāṭa, the Vṛndamādhava, the Cakradatta by Cakrapāṇi and the Viṣṇudharmottara purāṇa constitute the sources of the Agni purāṇa for its ayurvedic material. According to the author such material was attached to the Agni in the first quarter of the XII Century A.D. The Agni purāṇa, however, does not simply copy from its sources but at times enlarges them, hence it enhances knowledge on these subjects. The most significant example is the disclosure of the '*sarpamantra*', or *mantra* against snake bite which is not available in any of the other sources of ayurvedic treatises.

The book also contains various kinds of useful bits of information. Comparative tables help the reader throughout the text to determine relationship between the Agni purāṇa and the known works dealing with the same subject. The eleven appendices at the end are extremely helpful toward further research of a scientific nature in the purāṇa-s. They contain masses of useful information which will enhance studies and aid all those who want to know more regarding these topics. Compilers of dictionaries as well as scholars of purāṇa-s will benefit considerably from these appendices.

The book is commendable for its seriousness of research and for the abundance of its information. The few printing mistakes, especially the quotation of Viṣṇudharmottara purāṇa which has constantly I in place of II, should be removed in the second edition.

G. Bonazzoli

ACTIVITIES OF THE ALL-INDIA KASHIRAJ TRUST

(January-June, 1982)

Varāha Purāṇa Work

After publication of the critical edition and English translation of the Varāha Purāṇa its Hindi Translation is being revised and edited. It will soon go to the Press.

Garuḍa Purāṇa Work

Four MSS of the Garuḍa Purāṇa have been fully collated and compared : two belong to the Sarasvati Bhandar of Ramnagar Fort and two were taken on loan from Bhandarkar Oriental Institute of Pune. All four MSS are in Devanāgarī. One belonging to the Sarasvati Bhandar of Ramnagar contains all the three *khaṇḍa*-s, namely the Pūrvakhaṇḍa, the Uttarakhaṇḍa (or Pretakalpa) and the Brahmakhaṇḍa. Other MSS are being ordered from the Royal Society of Bengal, Calcutta, from Dacca University Library, from Bodleian Library, Oxford (U. K.) and from Universitätsbibliothek, Tübingen (W. Germany).

Veda-pārāyaṇa

In the bright half of the month of *Māgha* (*Māgha Śukla*), the Śukla Yajurveda Saṁhitā was recited in the Vyāseśvara temple of the Ramnagar Fort by Pt. Mahadeva Ghanapathi. Sri Visvanatha Shastri was Śrotā of the *Pārāyaṇa*. On the successful conclusion of the *Pārāyaṇa* usual *Dakṣiṇā* and certificates were awarded to the reciter and Śrotā.

Purāṇa-pāṭha and Pravacana

1. In the month of Caitra, the Adhyātma Rāmāyaṇa was recited in the Janakpur temple of Ramnagar by Sri Ramji Mishra. The *Pārāyaṇa* was held from Caitra Śukla Pratipad *tithi* up to Navamī *tithi*.
2. The Jñānakhaṇḍa of Tripura Rahasya was recited by Sri Ramji Mishra in the Bala Tripurā Sundarī Temple of Ramnagar from Āṣāḍha Śukla Pratipad upto Navamī.

Visitors to the Purāṇa Department

1. A group of six persons, among which the Chairman, Vice-Chairman, Secretary of the Haryana Bhumi Vikas

Bank (HSLDB). They wrote in the Visitor's Book '....are very much impressed by work being done by the Trust and the employees working. This is a great contribution being made by the Trust.' —On 7.1.1982

2. A. K. Narain, University of Wisconsin, Madison, U. S. A. यहाँ फिर आकर बड़ी प्रसन्नता हुई कि इस शोध संस्थान का कार्य हमेशा की तरह सभी तरह की परिस्थितियों के बावजूद सफलतापूर्वक चल रहा है ॥

—On 22.1.1982

3. Robin Thite, of British Council, Calcutta, with Kumar Rani of Burdawan : 'We were very pleased to have the opportunity to see something of the great work on the Puranas. It requires of all concerned much patience and devotion.'
4. K. T. Pandurangi, President, Mythic Society, Bangalore, Upakulapati Poornaprajna Vidyapeetha, Bangalore (Retired Prof. of Sanskrit, Bangalore University). On 11.2.1982.
5. C. R. Swaminathan, Deputy Educational Advisor (Skt), Ministry of Education, Govt. of India, New Delhi. On 2.5.1982.
6. Mr. Henry O. Thompson, Secretary of the Board of the Global Congress of World's Religions (GCWR). On 31.5.1982.

Demise of Dr. R. C. Hazra

Dr. R. C. Hazra passed way at his residence in Calcutta on 10.5.1982. He was a world renowned scholar of Purāṇas on which he wrote many books and articles opening new fields of research. He was a member of the Editorial Board of our Bulletin. The Chairman of the Trust as well as all the members of the Editorial Board and the staff of the Bulletin express their condolences and pray for eternal peace for his soul.

Research Scholars at the Purāṇa Department

It is not infrequent that scholars and research students come to the Purāṇa Department for completing their studies by using the books of the library and by conversing with the members of the staff

who are specialist in the Purāṇic field. Mrs. Uma Soni a research student of Sagar University visited our Department for a few days in June : her research topic is अन्नदाचरण का व्यक्तित्व एवं कृतित्व ॥

ACTIVITIES OF THE SISTER TRUSTS

Mahārāja Benares Vidyāmandira Maṅgalotsava

The annual Vasanta maṅgalotsava took place on 26-28 March 1982 in the evenings from 7 to 9 p.m. The three-day programme was held under the patronage of the Chairman of the Vidyāmandira Trust, H. H. Dr Vibhuti Narain Singh. The musical programme was held in the premises of the Vidyāmandira inside the Palace. The Chairman of the Trust, important persons of the town and of the Universities attended every day. A group of local people listened with interest to the classical music rendered by the students of the College of Performing Arts of B. H. U. On the last evening a Kathak dance was performed by three boys, students of the difficult art at Kabir Chowra in a traditional school.

Museum

The Museum is the main attraction throughout the year for pilgrims and tourists who come to Vārāṇasī. The rich arm collection and the ivories make Ramnagar Museum one of the best of its kind in India. Among the important visitors who signed the Visitor's Book, are :—

1. Brajraj Singh of Kishangarh and Major Pratap Singh.
2. Sir John and Lady Thomas, British High Commission in India.
3. Prince Anjun Quder, Chairman of Oudh's Trust, Calcutta. He writes in the visitors book : 'A very enjoyable and memorable visit to this great House of Benares, renews old ties of friendship extending to four generations.'
4. Major Raja Bahadur Birendra Bahadur Singh of Khairagarh M. P. Bhopal. 'A great Museum only of its kind in India. I have visited almost all the Museums in the country but I never saw such rare collections of arms,

ivory, houdah etc. both old and modern. I thank H. H. taking me round the Museum—very well kept indeed.'

5. Prince and Princess Czertwytynski, Belgian Embassy, New Delhi.
6. Mr. and Mrs. Michael Pisto, American Embassy, New Delhi.
7. Emilio Paolo Bassi, Ambassador of Italy, New Delhi, in a note, 'This is the second time I am coming to this magnificent Palace (with this rich, very well kept museum) and how I hope there will be a third one !'

Dhrupad Mela

The eighth Dhrupad Melā took place. It was organized at Tulsi Ghat, Vārāṇasī, under the auspices of the Vidyamandir Trust. For the occasion the open ground where the Dhrupad Mela took place was decorated and illuminated. The three night programme was performed under a '*shyamāna*' where many people, including several young men and women from abroad, spent the whole night in listening to the best artists in the field.

MAHARAJA UDIT NARAIN SINGH MĀNASA PRACĀRA NIDHI

Navahna Pārāyaṇa

As usual the Navahna Pārāyaṇa and Pravacana was performed in the Kālī Temple of Chakiā for nine days from Vaiśākha Śukla Pratipad upto Vaiśākha Navamī, i. e., from 24 April to 2 May, 1982. Pravacanakartā were Sivanarain Vyāsa and others.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF FOUR NEW PROJECTS

The All-India Kashiraj Trust has resolved to introduce four new Projects for the advancement of Purāṇic learning. The Trust heartily requests all scholars interested in Purāṇic study for co-operation.

(1) Publication of monographs dealing with Purāṇic literature (i.e. works bearing the names of Purāṇas or Upapurāṇas) in all the regional languages of India. Each monograph should

contain a detailed account of published works, of MSS. preserved in the libraries and the Private Collections and of works known through quotations.

(2) Publication of unpublished theses on important Purāṇic subjects.

(3) Publication of a series of monographs (not less than 100 pages) on the lives of the great sages as described in Purāṇic literature.

(4) Publication of Sanskrit Digests by traditional scholars on Purāṇic subjects. These digests may be published in the Bulletin also.

OUR REQUEST

We earnestly request the authorities of all Institutions (Universities, Colleges or Research Institutes) to send us detailed accounts of works, done or taken up by the members of their staff or by the Research Scholars, on the Purāṇas, Upapurāṇas and the Epics. They are also requested to send us the outlines of their Projects on Purāṇic studies and research. These accounts and outlines will enable us to prepare a Purāṇic Bibliography in near future.

Scholars interested in Purāṇic study may send to the Purāṇa Dept. any query of general interest about Purāṇic matters. These will be placed before competent persons for solution. These solutions may appear in the issues of the Bulletin.

पुराणम्

(भाग:-२४; अङ्क:-२)

PURĀNA

(Vol. XXIV. 2)

संस्कृत-खण्डः

पुराणवर्णिताः पाशुपता योगाचार्याः

प० ब्रजवल्लभद्विवेदः

[In a host of works on the Pāśupata and Śaiva philosophies and in some of the compendia on Indian philosophies we find a list of 28 Śaiva (Pāśupata) yogācāryas beginning with Śveta and ending with Nakulīśa or Lakulīśa. In some of the Purāṇas (namely Śiva-p., Līṅga-p. etc.) also, we find the names of these ācāryas (often with variations in the names).

In the Purāṇas each of these 28 ācāryas is said to have four disciples (112 in all). Names of many of these disciples (as given in the Purāṇas) have variations. In the Purāṇas and the Mahābhārata we find very little information about these teachers.

Fortunately the works on the Śaiva and Pāśupata śāstras contain some valuable pieces of information about the life and activities of these ācāryas. The author has tried to collect here all important pieces of information about these teachers from the aforesaid śāstras.

There is also a list of 18 avatāras of Śiva in the commentary by Guṇaratna on the Śaḍdarśana-samuccaya. A comparison of these names with the names stated in the Purāṇas and the philosophical works has also been made by the author.

An alphabetical list of all these teachers has also been given at the end of the article. —Editor]

हरदत्तविरचिता गणकारिका भासर्वज्ञरचितया रत्नटीकया सह बड़ोदा-
नगरस्थगायकवाङ्मोक्षसंस्थया प्रकाशिता । लकुलीशपाशुपतमतस्तथायं ग्रन्थः ।
अत्र परिशिष्टरूपेण विशुद्धिमुनिविरचितं यमप्रकरणम्, विशुद्धिमुनिकृतमात्म-
समर्पणम् अज्ञातकर्तृकः कारणपदार्थः, रुद्रनामानि, आचार्यहरिभद्रकृतस्य

१. गणकारिका भासर्वज्ञकृतिरिति तत्सम्पादकस्य मतं डॉ. सुरेन्द्रनाथदासमहोदयेन
(ए हिस्ट्री आफ इण्डियन फिलासफी, भा. ५, पृ. ११-१२), डॉ. कान्तिचन्द्र-
पाण्डेय महोदयेन (शैवदर्शनबिन्दुः, पृ० ३१) च खण्डितम् ।

षड्दर्शनसमुच्चयस्य,^१ राजशेखरसूरिकृतस्य च षड्दर्शनसमुच्चयस्य पाशुपतमत-
संबद्धोऽशः, सर्वदर्शनसंग्रहस्थं नकुलीशपाशुपतमतदर्शनम्, कारवणमाहात्म्य-
मित्येते स्वल्पकाया ग्रन्था अपि प्रकाशिता विद्यन्ते । तत्र विशुद्धिमुनिकृते
आत्मसमर्पणे श्वेतादिलकुलीशान्तानामष्टाविंशतिसंख्याकानां योगाचार्याणां
नामानीमानि दृश्यन्ते—

श्वेतः सुतारो दमनः सुगोत्र कङ्क एव च ।
लोकाक्षिजैगीषव्यौ च तथैव दधिवाहनः ॥
ऋषभो मुनिरुग्रश्च चित्रार्थालिश्च गौतमः ।
वेदशिरा गोकर्णश्च गुहावासिशिखण्डिनौ ॥
जटामाली चाट्टहासो दारुको लाङ्गली तथा ।
श्वेतः शूलयथ दण्डी च सहिष्णुः सोमशर्मकः ॥
लकुलीशश्चावतारा अष्टाविंशतिसंख्यकाः । इति ।

योगाचार्याणामेषां नामानि पाठभेदेन सह ^२स्कन्दपुराणस्य माहेश्वर-
खण्डान्तर्गतकौमारिकाखण्डस्य ४० तमे अध्यायेऽपि सन्ति । अन्यत्राष्टाविंशति-
संख्याकानामेषां शिवयोगिनां प्रत्येकं चत्वारः शिष्या इत्याहत्य ११२ संख्यकानां
शिष्याणां नामावली वर्तते । शिवपुराणे सैषा नामावली स्थलद्वये दृश्यते ।
एका तृतीयस्याः शतरुद्रसंहितायाश्चतुर्थे पञ्चमे चाध्याये, अपरा च सप्तम्या
वायवीयसंहिताया उत्तरभागस्य नवमेऽध्याये । तत्र प्रथमा नामावली वायु-
पुराणस्य २३ तमाध्यायानुसारिणी, अपरा च लिङ्गपुराणस्य सप्तमाध्यायस्थां
नामावलीमनुसरति । “अद्य ब्रह्मणोऽह्नि द्वितीयप्रहरार्धे श्रीश्वेतवाराहकल्पे
वेवस्वतमन्वन्तरेऽष्टाविंशतितमे कलियुगे” इति प्रत्यहं सन्ध्यावन्दनकाले वयं
भणामः । तत्र प्रथमस्यां नामावल्यां प्रतिद्वापरयुगं प्रादुर्भूतानां वेदव्यासानाम्,

१. आचार्यहरिभद्रसूरिणा श्लोकात्मकः षड्दर्शनसमुच्चयाख्यो ग्रन्थो रचितः । तत्र
गुणरत्नकृतं व्याख्यानं विद्यते । अत्र व्याख्याग्रन्थस्यांशविशेषः संगृहीत इति
विभावनीयम् ।

२. अत्र निबन्धे स्कन्दपुराण—वायुपुराण—लिङ्गपुराणानां मोरसंस्करणस्य, कूर्मपुराणस्य
मोरसंस्करण—काशीराजन्याससंस्करणयोः, शिवपुराणस्य च काशीपण्डितपुस्तकालय-
संस्करणस्य उपयोगः कृतः । आ. आत्मसमर्पणम्, कू. कूर्मपुराणम्, कूका. कूर्म-
पुराणकाशीराजन्याससंस्करणम्, लि. लिङ्गपुराणम्, वा. वायुपुराणम्, शिवा.
शिवपुराणवायवीयसंहिता, शिश. शिवपुराणशतरुद्रसंहिता, स्क. स्कन्दपुराणम्,
इति च संकेतपरिचयो बोध्यः ।

प्रतिकलियुगं प्रादुर्भूतानां योगाचार्याणां च नामावली^१ संयुक्ता वर्तते विस्तृता सविवरणा, अपरा च नामावली केवलं योगाचार्याणामेव । सैषा द्वितीया नामावली कूर्मपुराणेषु दृश्यते । सौभाग्यादस्माकमस्य पुराणस्य परिष्कृतं संस्करणं काशीराजन्यासमुद्रितं समुपलभ्यते । अस्मिन् संस्करणे पूर्वविभागीयैक-पञ्चाशोऽध्याये वर्तते सैषा नामावली । ततः पूर्वतने चाध्याये वेदव्यासावताराः परिगणिताः । अस्य संस्करणस्य विषयसंवादाख्ये द्वितीये परिशिष्टे व्यासाव-ताराणां^२ पुराणान्तरेषु वर्णितानां स्थलनिर्देशो वर्तते,^३ योगाचार्यावताराणां च पुराणान्तरेषु वर्णितानां स नास्ति । अतो यदस्माभिरुपलब्धं^४ तदाधारेणैव

१. अत्र शिवपुराणीयशतरुद्रसंहिताया इमे श्लोका विशेषतोऽवधेयाः सन्ति—“वैवस्वते-
ज्जन्तरे सम्यक् प्रोक्ता हि परमात्मना । योगेश्वरावताराश्च सर्वावर्तेषु सुव्रताः ।
व्यासाश्चैवाष्टविंशत्या द्वापरे द्वापरे विभो । योगेश्वरावताराश्च प्रारम्भे च कलौ
कलौ ॥” “संख्या द्वादशाधिक्यशतं च गणिता बुधैः ॥” (५१५१-५६) इति ।
तत्रैव वायवीयसंहितोत्तरभागेऽपि—“एते वाराहकल्पेऽस्मिन् सप्तमस्यान्तरे मनोः ।
अष्टाविंशतिराख्याता योगाचार्या युगक्रमात् ॥ शिष्याः प्रत्येकमेतेषां चत्वारः
शान्तचेतसः । श्वेतादयश्च रुष्यान्तास्तान् ब्रवीमि यथाक्रमम् ॥” (९१६-७) इति,
“एते शिष्या महेशस्य योगाचार्यस्वरूपिणः । संख्या च शतमेतेषां सह द्वादशसंख्या ॥
सर्वे पाशुपताः सिद्धा भस्मोद्धूलितविग्रहाः । सर्वशास्त्रार्थतत्त्वज्ञा वेदवेदाङ्गपारगाः ॥”
(९१२१-२२) इति च ।

२. व्यासावताराणां नामावलीष्वपि क्वचन वैभिन्न्यं दृश्यते । योगाचार्यनामावली-
परीक्षणमेव प्रकृतनिबन्धस्य विषय इति न साऽत्र परामृश्यते ।

३. शिवपुराण-लिङ्गपुराणयोरपि दृश्यते व्यासावतारनामावलीति न सार्वत्रिक्येन
स्थलनिर्देशो विहित इति प्रतिभाति । आगमसंहितातन्त्रादिग्रन्थेषु पुराणेषु च
समुपलभ्यन्ते समानविषयकाः समानानुपूर्विकाः श्लोकाः । स्थलानामीदृशानां
प्रामाणिकी सर्वाङ्गपूर्णा च विषयानुक्रमणी निर्मीयेत चेत् तुलनात्मकमनुशीलनमतीव
परिष्कृतं स्यात् । प्रत्येकं पुराणस्य पाठपरिष्कारात्मकसंस्करणवत् सम्पूर्णस्य
पुराणवाङ्मयस्य पाठपरिष्कारोऽपि परस्परसाहाय्येन कर्तुं शक्यते ।

४. योगाचार्यनामावली डॉ० सुरेन्द्रनाथदासगुप्तेन पूर्वोक्ते ग्रन्थे स्थलद्वये (पृ० ६, ७०)
चर्चिता । त. (पृ० ६) टिप्पण्यामन्यैर्विद्वद्भिः संगृहीता नामावली विनैव नामनिर्देशं
स्मर्यते । साम्याभावाच्च नामावलीयं कल्पनाप्रसूतेति (मिथिकल) च स निष्कर्षयति ।
तेन नास्या नामावल्याः परीक्षायै प्रयासो विधेय इति तस्याभिप्रायः प्रतीयते ।
पौराणिकीषु सर्वासु घटनासु किमपि तस्य पिहितमिति चास्माकीनो विश्वासः ।
एष विश्वास एव प्रवर्तयत्यस्मान्स्यां नामावलीपरीक्षायाम् । पाशुपतसूत्रसम्पादकेन
श्रीमताऽनन्तकृष्णशास्त्रिणा रचित उपोद्घातोऽप्यत्र द्रष्टव्यः । विशेषतस्तस्याद्यानि
पृष्ठानि ।

२८ योगाचार्याणाम्, ११२ संख्याकानां तच्छिष्याणां च नामावली सपाठभेदं समुपस्थाप्यते समालोच्यते च । द्विविधामपि नामावलीं समुपस्थापयत्सु निर्दिष्ट-पुराणश्लोकेषु वर्तते वक्तृश्रोत्रादिप्रयुक्तं महद्वैषम्यमिति, मा भूच्च वृथा निबन्ध-कलेवरवृद्धिरिति तत्रत्या श्लोका नात्र संगृह्यन्ते ।

२८ योगाचार्याः

१. श्वेतः । “भविष्यामि शिखायुक्तः” श्वेतो नाम महामुनिः । हिम-वच्छिखरे रम्ये छागले पर्वतोत्तमे ॥” (४।६-७) इत्येवं शिवपुराणीयशतरुद्र-संहितायां वायुपुराणे (२३।११५-११६) च प्रथमस्य योगाचार्यस्य परिचयो वर्तते । अत्र हिमवच्छिखरेषु छागलाख्यस्य पर्वतोत्तमस्य स्थितिर्भौगोलिकै-राधुनिकैर्गवेषणीया । छागलाख्यं नाम ज्ञानेन्द्रियभुवनं शैवसिद्धान्तग्रन्थेषु^२ वर्ण्यते । स्वच्छन्दतन्त्रे (१०।१०४६-१०६१) गुणतत्त्वे गुरुपङ्क्तित्रयं वर्ण्यते । तत्र श्वेतादीनां नामानि व्युत्क्रमेण पठितानि दृश्यन्ते । प्रथमस्यास्य योगाचार्यस्य श्वेत इत्येव सार्वत्रिकं नाम । नात्र पाठभेदः कचन दृश्यते । श्वेतमुनेरुपाख्यानं महाभारते^३ (आदि० १।२३३, शान्ति० १५३।६८, अनु० ११५।६६, १५०।५२), लिङ्गपुराणे (पू० २९-३० अ०) पराख्ये तन्त्रे च समुपलभ्यते । अन्यत्रापि स्यादेतत् । “निवृत्तिमार्गं सुदृढं वर्तयिष्ये कलाविह” (शिश० ४।१६), “निवृत्तिपथवर्धनः” (शिश० ४।२५), “निवृत्तिपथवृद्धये” (शिश० ४।३५),

१. शिवायुक्त इति शिश. पाठोऽशुद्धो मन्तव्यः, अग्रिम एव श्लोके “शिष्याः शिखायुक्ताः” (४।७) इति पाठदर्शनात् । “शिवे युक्ताः” (२३।११६) इति तु वा. पाठः । तत्रापि शिखायुक्ता इत्यनेनैव पाठेन भवितव्यम् । श्वेतमुनेर्हि द्वितीयस्य श्वेतशिख इति नाम दृश्यते । अष्टमस्य दधिवाहनाख्यस्य योगाचार्यस्य च शिष्यः पञ्चशिखो भवति । शिखिनः, मुण्डिनः, जटिनश्चेति त्रिविधा मुनयो भवन्ति । तत्र पाशुपता एते योगा-चार्याः शिखिनः स्युः ।

२. अस्मदीये तन्त्रयात्राख्ये निबन्धसंग्रहे “वैष्णवेषु तदितरेषु चागमेषु षडध्वविमर्शः” इति शीर्षको निबन्धो द्रष्टव्यः (पृ. २७) ।

वामदेवः, श्वेतः, लोकाक्षः, सुहोत्रः, गौतमः, दधिवाहः, ऋषभः, गोकर्णः, शिखण्डी, जटी, माली, उग्रः, भृगुः, शिखी, शूली, सुपालनः, अट्टहासः, दारुकः, लाङ्गली, लकुलेश इत्येतानि नामानि योगाचार्यनामावलीमनुकुर्वन्ति ।

३. महाभारते आदिपर्वणि (१।२२५-२३८) सुहोत्रः, काक्षीवान्, औशिजः, दमनः, युवनाश्वः, श्वेतः, कङ्कः, बलबन्धुः, निरामर्दः, केतुशृङ्ग इत्येते राजानो वर्ण्यन्ते । एतानि च नामानि योगाचार्याणामपि दृश्यन्ते । क्षत्रियः पाशुपतपद्धत्या शिवं समाराधयेदिति वामनपुराणं वदति (६।८६-९१) । तेन पाशुपताचार्येषु क्षत्रियनाम्नां संगतिर्बाधं सिद्ध्यति ।

इत्यादिवचनदर्शनादेते योगाचार्या निवृत्तिमार्गपरायणा आसन्निति प्रतीयते ।
 'प्रवृत्तिपरायणां मुनीन् निवृत्तिमार्गे प्रवर्तयितुं श्वेतो महामुनिर्दाख्यन् जगा-
 मेति लिङ्गपुराणीयं (१।२९।७-८) कथानकमप्यस्य मतस्य पोषकम् । ब्रह्म-
 सूत्रव्याख्याता श्रीकण्ठो नानागमविधायिनं श्वेतं^२ स्मरति । एवं च मुनिरयं
 पाशुपतमतस्य प्रवर्तकः प्रथमो योगाचार्य इति मन्तव्यम् ।

२. सुतारः । एतदेव सार्वत्रिकं नाम । कूका. इत्यत्र तु सुभान इति
 नाम मूले स्थापितम् ।

३. दमनः । मदनः—शिवा. कू.लि., तारणः—स्क. । दमनाख्यो ब्रह्मर्षि-
 महाभारते (वन० ५३।६-८) श्रूयते ।

४. सुहोत्रः । सुगोत्रः—आ., सुहोत्री—वा. । सुहोत्रनामकः प्राचीनो
 नृपतिर्ऋषिश्च महाभारते (आदि० १।३२६, वन० २६।२४) वर्ण्यते ।

५. कङ्कः । कङ्कणः—कू. कूका. स्क. । कङ्कनामकः प्राचीनो नृपति-
 महाभारते (आदि० १।२३३) दृश्यते ।

६. लोकाक्षिः । लौगाक्षिः—शिवा., लोकाख्यः—स्क. । ७५ संख्याकः
 शिष्योऽपि लोकाक्षिर्वर्तते । तत्रापि लौगाक्षिरिति पाठान्तरं दृश्यते ।

१. “तान् सात्वते क्रियामार्गे मद्वाक्याद् याहि योजय” (१।७) इति पाञ्चरात्रीयसात्वत-
 संहितावचनस्य अद्यावधि निवृत्तिपरायणान् मुनीन् सात्वतशास्त्रोदिते शुद्धे क्रियामार्गे
 प्रवृत्तिप्रवणे योजयेत्यभिप्रायो भवति । “तृतीयमृषिसर्गं च देवपितृत्वमुपेत्य सः । तन्त्रं
 सात्वतमाचष्ट नैष्कर्म्यं कर्मणां यतः ॥” (१।३।८) इति भागवतपद्यव्याख्याने
 श्रीधरः—“कर्मणामेव मोचकत्वं यतो भवति तदाचष्टेत्यर्थः” इत्याह । “प्रवृत्ति-
 लक्षणश्चैष धर्मो नारायणात्मकः” (३४७।८३) इत्येवं च महाभारते नारायणीयो-
 पाख्याने प्रतिपाद्यते । तेन पाशुपतो धर्मो निवृत्तिलक्षणः, पाञ्चरात्रधर्मश्च प्रवृत्ति-
 लक्षणः सिद्धयति । सांख्ययोगाचार्यः पञ्चशिखो महाभारते (शान्ति. २१८।११)
 पञ्चस्रोतसि निष्णातः पञ्चरात्रविशारदश्च वर्ण्यते । तेनाभयधर्माभिज्ञः स इति
 सिद्धयति । पशुपतेः शिवस्य पञ्चवक्त्रेभ्यः पञ्चस्रोतसु शिवागमाः प्रवर्तन्त इति
 च स्मर्तव्यमत्र ।

२. “नमः श्वेताभिधानाय नानागमविधायिने” इति विद्यते तत्रत्यं मङ्गलाचरण-
 चतुर्थपद्यम् । अत्र श्रीकण्ठभाष्यव्याख्याकारोऽप्ययदीक्षितो वक्ति—“अनेन श्लोकेन
 शिवशास्त्रप्रचारणार्थशिवावताररूपाणामष्टाविंशतेर्योगाचार्याणामाद्यस्य श्वेताचार्य-
 स्यापि नमस्कारः क्रियते । अस्मिन् पक्षे ‘नानागमविधायिने’ इत्यस्य ‘नानाविध-
 पाशुपताद्यागमनिर्मात्रे’ इत्यर्थः” इति । तेन च योगाचार्येष्वाद्यस्य श्वेतस्य नाना-
 गमनिर्मातृत्वं सिद्धयतीति नेत्रं नामावली कल्पनामात्रप्रसूतेति विभावनीयं
 विपश्चिद्धिः ।

७. जैगीषव्यः । “योगं संदृढयिष्यामि महायोगविचक्षणः । काश्यां गुहान्तरे संस्थो दिव्यदेशे कुशास्तरिः ॥” (शिश० ४।२८) इत्येवं सप्तमस्य योगाचार्यस्य जैगीषव्यस्य वर्णनं दृश्यते । वाराणस्यां काशीगुहा प्रसिद्धा । तस्मिन् दिव्यदेशे कुशास्तरण एष योगाचार्यः प्रादुर्भूत इत्यनेन ज्ञायते । ^१ब्रह्मसभायां राजमानो जैगीषव्यो महर्षिर्महाभारते सभापर्वणि (११।२४) वर्ण्यते । जैगीषव्यदेवलयोः संवादो महाभारते शल्यपर्वणि (५० ५३-५५) जैगीषव्यासितयोस्तत्रैव शान्तिपर्वणि (२२९।३-४), योगसूत्रव्यासभाष्ये (३।१८) च आवृत्यजैगीषव्यसंवादो वर्ण्यते ।

८. दधिवाहनः । दधिवाहः—शिवा. कूका. । दधिवाहनाख्यः प्राचीनो नृपतिर्महाभारते (शान्ति. ४९।८०) दृश्यते ।

९. ऋषभः । वृषभः—कूका., ऋभतः—शिश., एष पाठस्त्वशुद्धः प्रतिभाति । महाभारते (वन. ११०।८, सभा. ११।२४, शान्ति. १२५-१२८ अ.) ऋषभाख्यस्य महर्षेः परिचय उपदेशादिकं च वर्तते ।

१०. भृगुः । दशमस्य योगाचार्यस्य मुनिरिति नाम बाहुल्येन दृश्यते । मुनिधर्म इति स्क. पाठः, भृगुरिति तु कू. कूका. पाठः । “हिमवच्छिखरे रम्ये भृगुतुङ्गे^२ नगोत्तमे । नाम्ना भृगोस्तु शिखरं तस्मात् तच्छिखरं भृगुः ॥ तत्रापि मम पुत्राश्च भृङ्गाद्याः श्रुतिसंमताः ॥” (शिश. ५।१-२, वा. २३।१४८-१४९) इत्येवमस्य वर्णनदर्शनाद् भृगुरित्येवास्य योगाचार्यस्य नाम स्वीकर्तव्यम् । अस्याचार्यस्य श्रुतिसंमतेषु चतुर्षु शिष्येषु प्रथमस्य भृङ्गस्यात्र निर्दिष्टस्य नाम न कचन दृश्यत इति पाठ एष परीक्षणीयः । महर्षेर्भृगोर्विस्तृतः परिचयो महाभारते द्रष्टव्यः ।

११. उग्रः । एकादशस्य उग्राख्यस्य योगाचार्यस्य नाम शिश. इत्यत्र स्पष्टं न ज्ञायते, किन्तु तस्य प्रादुर्भावस्थली गङ्गाद्वारमिति तत्र निर्दिष्टम् । उग्रा—वा. इति त्वशुद्धः पाठः । पुरुषतत्त्वे स्थितमुग्राख्यं भुवनं शैवागमेषु वर्ण्यते । उग्राख्यः शिष्योऽपि ५४ संख्याको द्रष्टव्यः । प्रजापतेः कवेः पुत्र उग्रो महाभारते (अनु. ८५।१३३) दृश्यते ।

१२. अत्रिः । अत्रिवर्णने “हेमकञ्चुकमासाद्य” इति शिश.पाठः, “हेमकं वनमासाद्य” इति च वा.पाठः । द्वादशत्रयोदशयोगाचार्ययोर्नामनी

१. महाभारते सभापर्वणि (११।१९-२४) भृगुः, अत्रिः, वसिष्ठः, गौतमः, अङ्गिराः, च्यवनः, सनत्कुमारः, देवलः जैगीषव्यः, ऋषभ इत्येते ऋषयो ब्रह्मसभामुपतिष्ठन्त इति वर्ण्यते ।

२. भृगुः, भृगुतीर्थस्य, भृगुतुङ्गस्य नगोत्तमस्य च वर्णनं महाभारतेऽपि बहुषु स्थलेषु वर्तते ।

चित्रार्थालिख—आ. इत्येवं दृश्येते । अत्र च स्पष्टं न किमपि ज्ञायते । ५३ संख्याकः शिष्योऽपि तन्नाम्नेव प्रसिद्धः । ब्रह्मर्षिरत्रिंश्व महाभारतपुराणादिषु प्रथित एव ।

१३ बलिः । बलिः, बालिर्वा महामुनिर्बालिल्याश्रमे गन्धमादने पर्वतोत्तमे प्रादुर्भूत इति शिश. वा. इत्याभ्यां ज्ञायते । बालिः—कू. बली—कूका., सुपालकः—शिवा., सुबालकः—लि., सबालकः—स्क. । युधिष्ठिर-सभायां विद्यमानो बलिर्नाम ऋषिर्महाभारते (सभा० ४।१०) वर्ण्यते ।

१४. गौतमः । आङ्गिरसे वंशे गौतमवने प्रादुर्भूत एष योगाचार्य इति शिश. वा. इत्याभ्यां ज्ञायते । अत्र पाठान्तरं नास्ति । ८४ संख्याकः शिष्योऽपि गौतमः । महाभारतादिषु विवरणं द्रष्टव्यम् ।

१५. वेदशिराः । एष योगाचार्यः सरस्वत्या उत्तरे भागे हिमवत्पृष्ठ-वर्तिनि वेदशीर्षाख्ये नगोत्तमे प्रादुर्भूतः । वेदशीर्षा—कूका, वेदशीर्षः—लि., वेददर्शी—कू. वेदशीर्षः—स्क. । वेदशिरा नाम प्राचीन ऋषिर्महाभारते (शान्ति. ३३६।८) दृश्यते ।

१६. गोकर्णः । सुपुण्ये गोकर्णवने गोकर्णस्य प्रादुर्भावो वर्ण्यते शिश. वा. इत्युभयोः स्थलयोः । अत्र पाठान्तरं न दृश्यते । गोकर्णं नाम आकाशतत्त्व-भुवनं शिवागमेषु वर्ण्यते । तीर्थरूपेण तपोवनरूपेण च महाभारते बहुषु स्थलेषु वर्ण्यते ।

१७. गुहावासी । “हिमवच्छिखरे शुभे ॥ महालये महोत्तुङ्गे शिवक्षेत्रं हिमालयम् । सिद्धक्षेत्रं महापुण्यं भविष्यति महालयम् ॥” (शिश. ५।१८-१९, वा. २३।१७४-१७५) इत्येवं शिश. वा. इत्यत्र महालयाख्यं स्थानमस्य योगाचार्यस्य प्रादुर्भावस्थलत्वेन निर्दिष्टम् । गुहावासः—कू. कूका. पाठान्तरम् ।

१८. शिखण्डी । हिमवच्छिखरे सिद्धिक्षेत्रे महापुण्ये शिखण्डी नाम पर्वतः, सिद्धनिषेवितं शिखण्डिनो वनं च राजते । तत्रैव शिखण्ड्याख्यस्य योगाचार्यस्य प्रादुर्भावो वर्ण्यते पूर्वोक्तयोरुभयोरपि स्थलयोः । ईश्वरतत्त्वे स्थितमेतन्नामकं भुवनं शिवागमेषु श्रूयते । शिखण्डभृत्—लि. स्क., शिखण्डधृक्—कू. । शिखया मयूरपिच्छेन वा विशिष्टः सम्बन्धो योगाचार्याणामित्यनेन नाम्नाऽपि ज्ञायते ।

१९. जटामाली । हिमवच्छिखरे रम्ये यत्र जटायुर्नाम पर्वतो विराजते, तत्रैव जटामालिनो योगाचार्यस्य प्रादुर्भावः । यजमाली—कू., जटी माली—शिश. ।

१. महाभारते सभापर्वणि (४।१०-१८) देवलः, सत्यः, बलिः, वकः, दालभ्यः, सुमन्तुः, जैमिनिः, भालुकिः, भृगुः, काक्षीवान्, औशिजः, गौतम इत्येते मुनयो युधिष्ठिरसभायामासन्ति वर्ण्यते ।

२०. अट्टहासः । हिमवत्पृष्ठे देवदानवयक्षेन्द्रसिद्धचारणसेवितो महा-
गिरिरट्टहासो नाम राजते । अट्टहासप्रिया जनास्तत्र निवसन्ति । तत्रैवास्य
योगाचार्यस्य प्रादुर्भावः । अट्टहासाख्यं नाम वायुतत्त्वभुवनं शैवागमेषु स्मर्यते ।
अत्र पाठान्तरं नास्ति ।

२१. दारुकः । महति देवदारुवने दारुवने वा दारुकाख्यस्य योगाचार्यस्य
प्रादुर्भावः । दारुकं नाम कर्मेन्द्रियभुवनं शैवागमेषु द्रष्टव्यम् । दारुणः—स्क.
इति पाठान्तरम् ।

२२. लाङ्गुली । 'तदाऽप्यहं भविष्यामि वाराणस्यां महामुनिः ॥
नाम्ना वै लाङ्गुली भीमो यत्र देवाः सवासवाः । द्रव्यन्ति मां कलौ तस्मिन्'^१
भवं चैव हलायुधम् ॥' (शिश. ५।३०-३१ वा २३।१९९-२००) इत्येवं
वर्ण्यतेऽयं योगाचार्यः । लाङ्गुली—शिवा. ।

२३. महाकालः । "गिरौ कालञ्जरे शुभे ॥ तत्र कालं जरिष्यामि तदा
गिरिवरोत्तमे । तेन कालञ्जरो नाम प्रविष्यति स पर्वतः ॥" (शिश. ५।३३-३४,
वा. २३।२०३-२०४) इत्येवमस्य योगाचार्यस्य प्रादुर्भावस्थलं वर्ण्यते । अस्या-
चार्यस्य श्वेत इति नाम शिश. वा. आ. कूका. इत्येवं बहुषु स्थलेषु दृश्यते ।
प्रथमस्य योगाचार्यस्य तच्छिष्यस्य चाप्येतदेव नाम वर्तते । तत्तु उपर्युक्तेन
विवरणेन सह न घटत इति नास्माभिर्मुख्यत्वेन स्थाप्यते । महाकाल इत्येव नाम
तद्वर्णनं सार्थकयति । महाकायमुनिः—लि., महायामो मुनिः—कू., संयमी—
स्क. इत्येतानि पाठान्तराणि चास्य विशेषणतया योजनीयानि । ६७ संख्याकः
शिष्योऽपि महाकायाख्यो वर्तते । महाकालाख्य तेजस्तत्त्वभुवनम्, कालञ्जरं
नाम ज्ञानेन्द्रियभुवनं च शैवागमेषु द्रष्टव्यम् । कालञ्जरं निकषा सिद्धान्त-
शैवागमाः^२ प्रसूति लेभिरे, यत्र हि योगाचार्यस्य त्रयोविंशतितमस्य प्रादुर्भावः
समजायतेति परीक्षणसापेक्षोऽयं विषयः । शिवपार्षदत्वेन (सभा. १०।३४),
ज्योतिर्लिङ्गत्वेन (वन. ८२।४९) च महाभारते महाकालो वर्ण्यते ।

१. तस्मिन्नवतीर्णं हलायुधम्—वा. ।

२. "निःशेषशास्त्रसदनं किल मध्यदेशः" (तन्त्रा. ३७।३८) इत्यभिनवगुप्तो वक्ति ।
"तदा श्रीकण्ठनाथाज्ञावशात् सिद्धा अवातरन् ॥ अम्बकामर्दकाभिख्यश्रीनाथा
अद्वये द्वये । द्वयाद्वये च निपुणाः क्रमेण शिवशासने ॥.....अतश्चार्चचतस्रोऽत्र
मठिकाः सन्ततिक्रमात् ।" (तन्त्रा. ३६।११-१४) इति च स एवाह । आमर्दक-
तीर्थम्, शङ्खमठिका, अम्बक(तेरम्ब)मठिका च तदनुसारमुक्तस्य त्रिविधस्य
शिवशासनस्य प्रसारस्थलान्यासन् । एतानि च झाँसीनगरं परितः पूर्वमवस्थिता-
न्यासन्नित्याधुनिका ऐतिहासिका वदन्ति । कालञ्जरतीर्थस्यापि तत्रैवावस्थितिर्वर्तते ।

२४. शूलो । शूलो नाम महायोगी योगिवन्दिते नैमिषे समजायत । नैमिषं नाम जलीयं भुवनं शैवागमेषु वर्ण्यते । नैमिषारण्यं च पुराणप्रवचनपीठत्वेन प्रथितम् ।

२५. डिण्डिमुण्डीशः । दण्डीमुण्डीशः—शिवा., दण्डी—आ., डिण्डी—कूका., दण्डी मुण्डीश्वरः—लि. शिवा. वा., डिण्डमुण्डीश्वरः—कू., डिण्डीजुण्डीश्वरः—स्क. इतीमानि पाठान्तराण्यत्र दृश्यन्ते । डिण्डिमुण्डीरिति जलीयं भुवनं स्वच्छन्दतन्त्रे (१०।८५४) वर्ण्यते । तेन डिण्डिमुण्डीश इत्येव नाम प्रधानत्वेनात्र स्थाप्यते ।

२६. सहिष्णुः । भद्रवटं पुरम्, पुण्यं रुद्रवटं वा प्राप्य सहिष्णुः समजायत । सविष्णुः—शिवा., मुण्डी सहिष्णुः—कूका. इति पाठद्वयमप्यशुद्धम् । वस्तुतस्तु मुण्डीति पदं दण्डी इत्यनेन सह योजनीयम् ।

२७. सोमशर्मा । प्रभासतीर्थमासाद्य सोमशर्मा प्रादुर्भूतः । नास्ति पाठान्तरमत्र । प्रभासं नाम जलतत्त्वभुवनं शैवागमेषु वर्ण्यते । प्रभासतीर्थं च "सौराष्ट्रे सोमनाथं च" इत्यादिना वर्णितं प्रभासपट्टनमेव ।

२८. लकुलीशः । तदाऽप्यहं भविष्यामि योगात्मा योगमायया । लोकविस्मापनार्थाय ब्रह्मचारिशरीरकः ॥ श्मशाने मृतमुत्सृज्य दृष्ट्वा कायमनामयम् । ब्राह्मणानां हितार्थाय प्रविष्टो योगमायया ॥ दिव्यां मेरुगुहां पुण्यां त्वया सार्धं च विष्णुना । भविष्यामि तदा ब्रह्मल्लकुली नाम नामतः ॥ कायावतार^१ इत्येवं सिद्धक्षेत्रं परं तदा ।" (शिश. ५।४५-४८, वा. २३।२२०-२२३) इत्येवं वर्ण्यतेऽयमन्तिमो योगाचार्यः शिश. वा. इत्यनयोः स्थलयोः । स्थलमेतत् साम्प्रतं गुजरातराज्ये बड़ोदानगरं निकषा 'कारवण'नाम्ना प्रथितमस्ति । लकुलीश्वरः—शिवा., लकुली—शिश., नकुली—वा., नकुलीश्वरः—कू., नकुलीशः—कूका. । शास्त्रेषु नकुलीशः, लकुलीश इत्युभयविधमपि नाम समुपलभ्यते, तथापि लकुटपाणिरयं शिवावतारो लकुलीशनाम्नैव ज्ञातव्यः । एष एवाचार्यो लकुलीशपाशुपतमतस्य प्रवर्तकः, पाशुपतसूत्राणां प्रणेता । पाशुपतेषु योगाचार्येष्वयमन्तिम इति पाशुपतमतप्रस्थापकोऽप्ययमेवाचार्य इति केषाञ्चनाधुनिकानां मतं भ्रान्तिविजृम्भितमिति मन्तव्यम् ।

योगाचार्याणामेषां ११२ शिष्याः

वामनपुराणस्य षष्ठाध्यायस्य ८६-९१ श्लोकेषु हरार्चकानां चत्वारो मेदा वर्णिताः शैव-पाशुपत-कालवदन-कापालिकाख्याः, चातुर्वर्ण्येन चैषां

१. कायारोहणमित्येवं—वा. ।

सम्बन्धः स्थापितः । ब्राह्मणः शैवमतेन, क्षत्रियः पाशुपतक्रमेण, वैश्यः कालास्य-
पद्धत्या, शूद्रश्च कापालिककर्मणा शिवं समुपासीतेति तस्याभिप्रायः प्रतीयते ।
अत्रापि प्रत्येकं योगाचार्यस्य चत्वारः शिष्याः श्रूयन्ते । किमेषामपि चातुर्वर्ण्येन
कश्चनः सम्बन्धः समस्ति ? नास्य प्रश्नस्योत्तरं कापि दृश्यते । गवेषणीयं तत् ।
योगाचार्याणां केषाञ्चन आविर्भावस्थलादिकं वर्ण्यते पुराणेषु । शिष्याणां तु
तादृशं विवरणं कापि न दृश्यते । केवलं नामावली वर्तते । पाठभेदपुरस्सरं सात्र
समुपस्थाप्यते यावदुपलब्धपरिचयसहिता ।

१. श्वेतः । प्रथमस्य, त्रयोविंशतितमस्य च योगाचार्यस्य कुत्रचिन्नामैतद्
दृश्यते । प्रथमस्य श्वेताख्यस्य योगाचार्यस्य प्रथमः शिष्योऽपि तन्नामक एवेति
सर्वत्र परिदृश्यमानं पाठान्तररहितं नामैतत् कामपि समस्यां समुपस्थापयति ।
दूरस्थे शिष्ये भवतु नाम नाम्नः पुनरावृत्तिः । अत्र तु साक्षाच्छिष्ये सा
दृश्यते ।

२. श्वेतशिखः । शिखः—वा., श्वेतशिखण्डी—लि. ।

३. श्वेताश्वः । श्वेतास्यः—कूका. । ७१ संख्याकस्य शिष्यस्य
श्यावान्धः श्यावास्य इति वा नाम दृश्यते । कालास्य इति च शिवार्चकेषु
तृतीयस्य नाम ।

४. श्वेतलोहितः ।

५. दुन्दुभिः ।

६. शतरूपः ।

७. ऋचीकः । हृषीकः—शिवा. शिश. लि. । पाठान्तरेषु ७० संख्याकः
शिष्योऽपि ऋचीकः श्रूयते । ऋचीको महर्षिर्महाभारते बहुषु स्थलेषु वर्ण्यते ।

८. केतुमान् । ८३ संख्याकः शिष्योऽप्येतन्नामक एव । युधिष्ठिरसभायां
विद्यमानं नृपतिद्वयं महाभारते (सभा. ४।२७, ३२) इत्यत्र दृश्यते । नास्ति
पाठान्तरम् ।

९. विशोकः । विकोशः—शिवा. । महाभारते कश्चन केकयराजकुमार
एतन्नामको वर्ण्यते (द्रोण. ८२।३) ।

१०. विकेशः । विशेषः—शिश. ।

११. विपाशः । विशापः—वा. कूका., विपापः—शिश., विशाखः—कू. ।

१२. पापनाशनः । शापनाशनः—वा. कू. कूका., पाशनाशनः—लि. ।

१३. सुमुखः । कश्चन नृपतिर्महाभारते (सभा. ५१ । ७ दाक्षिणात्ये
पाण्डे) वर्ण्यते ।

१४. दुर्मुखः । नास्ति पाठान्तरम् ।

१५. दुर्दमः । दुर्गमः—शिवा. । दुर्दर्भः—शिश. ।

१६. दुरतिक्रमः । नास्ति पाठान्तरम् । सात्वतसहितायां (१०।२६) सिद्धदशकेषु दुरतिक्रमः पठ्यते ।

१७. सनत्कुमारः । महातपस्वी योगाचार्यो भगवान् सनत्कुमारो ब्रह्म-सभायां ब्रह्माणमुपासत इति महाभारते (सभा. ११।२३) वर्ण्यते । एतत्संबद्धा अन्या अपि कथास्तत्रैव द्रष्टव्याः । दालभ्यः—कू. कूका. पाठान्तरम् । युधिष्ठिर-सभायां विद्यमानो महर्षिर्दालभ्यो महाभारते (सभा. ४।११) द्रष्टव्यः ।

१८. सनकः । सनः—वा. कूका. ।

१९. सनन्दनः । सनन्दः—शिवा. लि. ।

२०. सनातनः । युधिष्ठिरसभायां विद्यमानो महर्षिर्महाभारते (सभा. ४।१६) वर्ण्यते ।

२१. सुधामा । षष्ठस्य लोकाक्षेः, त्रयोदशस्य च बलैर्योगाचार्यस्य द्वौ द्वौ शिष्यौ समाननामानौ स्तः । अत्र ४९ संख्याकस्य शिष्यस्य नाम द्रष्टव्यम् ।

२२. विरजाः । विरजः—वा. । ५२ संख्याकः शिष्योऽप्येतन्नामक एव । प्रजापतेः कवेः पुत्र एतन्नामको महाभारते (अनु. ८५।१३३) द्रष्टव्यः ।

२३. शङ्खपादः । शङ्खः—शिवा., शङ्खवाणो—कू., संजयः—शिश । शङ्खपात्रज—कूका. इति माठोऽशुद्धः । शङ्खपादज इति पाठेन तत्र भाव्यम् । तदेव शिष्यसंख्यापूर्तिः संजायेत । वर्तते च स पाठस्तत्र टिप्पण्याम् ।

२४. अजः । अण्डजः—शिवा., वैरजः—लि., रवः—वा., विजयः—शिश. । अजनामक ऋषिगणो महाभारते (शान्ति. २६।७) सूच्यते ।

२५. सारस्वतः । एतन्नामकः प्राचीन ऋषिर्महाभारते (शल्य. ५।१३, ७-११४, वन. ८५।४६, शान्ति. २०।८।३१) द्रष्टव्यः ।

२६. मेघः । मोघः—कू., योगीशः—शिश., सुमेघः—वा० । महाभारते (अनु. १५।०।४५) तु योगाख्यः कश्चन ऋषिर्वर्ण्यते ।

२७. मेघवाहः । धनवाहः—कूका., धनवाहः—कू. वसुवाहः—वा. ।

२८. सुवाहनः । सुवाहकः—शिवा. ।

२९. कपिलः । सुप्रथितः सांख्याचार्यः ।

३०. आमुचिः । सुप्रथितः सांख्याचार्यः ।

३१. पञ्चशिखः । सुप्रथितो योगाचार्यः । महाभारते (शान्ति. २१।८।११) अयमाचार्यः पञ्चस्रोतसि निष्णातः पञ्चरात्रविशारदश्च वर्ण्यते ।

३२. वोढुः । वाष्कलः—शिवा. लि., वाग्बलिः—वा., शाल्वलः—शिश. ।

३३. पराशरः । पराशरो महर्षिर्वसिष्ठपौत्रत्वेन प्रथिततमः ।

३४. गर्गः । गार्ग्यः—वा. । महाभारते (शान्ति. ३१८।५९-६३) वर्णितोऽस्योपदेशो द्रष्टव्यः ।

३५. भार्गवः । पञ्चशिखशिष्यत्वेन ^१सांख्यकारिकामाठरवृत्तौ (७१का.) वर्ण्यते ।

३६. अङ्गिराः । गिरिशः—शिवा. । ब्रह्मणो मानसपुत्रेषु परिगण्यते । महाभारतादिषु विवरणं समुपलभ्यते ।

३७. बलबन्धुः । चलबन्धुः—कू. । महाभारते (आदि. १।२३७) प्राचीनः कश्चन नृपतिर्बलबन्धुनामकः । अन्येषामपि योगाचार्याणां नामान्यत्र दृश्यन्ते ।

३८. निरामित्रः । नरोमित्रः—शिश० । महाभारते (आदि. १।२३७) बलबन्धुना सह निरामर्द इति नाम दृश्यते ।

३९. केतुशृङ्गः । महाभारते (आदि० १।२३७) उक्ताभ्यां नामभ्यां सह पठ्यते ।

४०. तपोधनः । ८८ संख्याकः शिष्योऽप्येतन्नामकः पाठान्तरेषु दृश्यते ।

४१. लम्बोदरः । पाठभेदो न दृश्यते ।

४२. लम्बः । प्रलम्बकः—शिश. ।

४३. लम्बाक्षः । लम्बात्मा—शिवा., विक्रोशः—कू. ।

४४. लम्बकेशकः । केशलम्बः—शिश., लम्बकः शुकः—कू. इति त्वशुद्धः पाठः ।

४५. सर्वज्ञः ।

४६. समबुद्धिः ।

४७. साध्यः ।

४८. सत्यः । सर्वः—शिवा. लि. वा., शर्वः—शिश. । युधिष्ठिर-सभायां राजमान ऋषिर्महाभारते (सभा. ४।१०) सत्याख्यो वर्ण्यते ।

४९. सुधामा । २१ संख्याकः शिष्योऽप्येतन्नामक एव । उभयत्रापि पाठभेदो न दृश्यते ।

१. भार्गवः, उलूकः, वाल्मीकिः, हारीतः, देवलश्चेति मुनयः पञ्चशिखशिष्यत्वेन तत्र वर्णिताः । तेषु भार्गवः, उलूकः, देवलश्चेति नामत्रयमत्राप्यस्ति । सांख्यकारिका-व्याख्यायां भुक्तिदीपिकायां च अक्षपादः, आसुरिः, ऋषभेश्वरः, कणादः, कपिलः, कश्यपः, गौतमः, पञ्चशिखः, भृगुः, वसिष्ठः, वादलिः, सनकः, सनत्कुमारः, सनन्दनः, सनातन इत्येते आचार्याः स्मर्यन्ते । तत्र ऋषभ एव ऋषभेश्वरः, वाग्बलिरेव वादलिरिति वयमुत्पश्यामः ।

५० कश्यपः । काश्यपः—लि. कू. शिश. कूका. । काश्यपः ६१ संख्यायामपि वर्तते । तत्रापि कश्यप इति पाठान्तरम् । तेनात्र कश्यपस्तत्र च काश्यप इति नाम स्थाप्यते । कश्यपः काश्यपश्च महाभारतादिषु पृथक्तया वर्ण्यते ।

५१. वसिष्ठः । वासिष्ठः—लि., वर्षिष्ठः—शिश. ।

५२. विरजाः । २२ संख्याकः शिष्योऽपि । तत्रत्यं विवरणं द्रष्टव्यम् ।

५३. अत्रिः । १२ संख्याकस्याचार्यस्याप्येतदेव नाम ।

५४. उग्रः । ११ संख्याकस्याचार्यस्याप्येतदेव नाम । देवसदः—लि., दवशदः—शिश., उग्रतपाः—वा. इति पाठान्तराणि । पुरुषतत्त्वे स्थितमुग्राख्यं भुवनं शैवागमेषु द्रष्टव्यम् ।

५५. श्रवणः । श्रावणः—वा. ।

५६. श्रविष्ठकः । सुवेद्यकः—कू., श्रविष्टकः—वा. श्रविष्कटः—शिश. ।

५७. कुणिः । १०९ संख्याकस्य शिष्यस्य कुणिक इति नाम । अत्र पाशुपत-सूत्रसम्पादकस्य उपोद्घातस्य (पृ. ३) टिप्पणी द्रष्टव्या । कुणिरेव आर्यभट इति तस्याभिप्रायः ।

५८. कुणिबाहुः । कुणिगर्गनामकः कश्चन ऋषिर्महाभारते (शल्य. ५२।३) वर्ण्यते ।

५९. कुशरीरः ।

६०. कुनेत्रकः ।

६१. काश्यपः । कश्यपः—लि. कू. कूका. । ५० संख्यायामपि पाठान्तरे दृश्यते तदेतन्नाम ।

६२. उशनाः । भृगोः पुत्रस्य शुक्राचार्यस्य नामान्तरम् । महाभारते (आदि. ६५।३६) द्रष्टव्यम् ।

६३. च्यवनः । भृगोः पुत्रस्य च्यवनस्योपाख्यानं भारतादिषु द्रष्टव्यम् ।

६४. बृहस्पतिः । महर्षेरङ्गिरसः पुत्रस्य बृहस्पतेरुपाख्यानादिकं भारतादिषु वर्ण्यते ।

६५. उत्तथ्यः । उच्चास्यः—कू. । महर्षेरङ्गिरसो मध्यमः पुत्रः । महाभारते (आदि. ६६।५, शान्ति ९०-९१ अ., अनु. १५४।११, २२ १८) परिचयोपदेशादिकं दृश्यते ।

६६. वामदेवः । वामदेवः प्रथितो महर्षिरितिहासपुराणादिषु वर्ण्यते । मायातत्त्वे स्थितं वामदेवाख्यं भुवनं शैवागमेषु द्रष्टव्यम् ।

६७. महाकायः । महाकालः—शिवा. कू., महायोगः—लि. शिश. । २३ संख्याकस्याचार्यस्य विवरणमत्र द्रष्टव्यम् ।

६८. महालयः । महानिलः—शिवा. कूका., महानिलः—कू., महा-
बलः—लि. शिश. । महालयं नाम आकाशतत्त्वभुवनं शैवागमेषु द्रष्टव्यम् ।

६९. वाचःश्रवा । वाजःश्रवा—कू., वाचस्रवा—वा. ।

७०. सुवीरः । सुपीकः—कूका., सुधीकः—लि., सुकेशः—कू., ऋचोकः—
शिश., ऋचोकः—वा. । ७ संख्याकः शिष्योऽपि ऋचोकनामा वर्तते ।

७१. श्यावाश्वः । श्यावास्यः—शिश., श्यावकः—शिवा. लि. । तृतीयस्य
शिष्यस्य विवरणमप्यत्र द्रष्टव्यम् ।

७२. यतीश्वरः । सुपथीश्वरः—कूका., सुपरथीश्वरः—कू., दृढव्रतः—वा.,
संयताश्वकः—कूका. पाठान्तरम् । दृढव्रतो ब्रह्मर्षिर्महाभारते (शान्ति २०८।
२८-२८) वर्ण्यते । यतिश्च विश्वामित्रपुत्रस्तत्रैव (अनु. ४।५८) दृश्यते ।

७३. हिरण्यनाभः । हिरण्यनामा—शिवा. । हिरण्यनाभ इति नाम
महाभारते (शान्ति. १२९।१४९) दृश्यते ।

७४. कौशल्यः । कौशिल्यः—वा. ।

७५. लोकाक्षिः । लौगाक्षिः—लि., अकाक्षुः—कू., लोकाक्षी—शिश.,
काक्षीवः—वा. । गौतमस्य ऋषेः पुत्रः काक्षीवान् महाभारते (सभा. ४।१७,
१७।२२, २१।५) वर्ण्यते । षष्ठ आचार्योऽपि लोकाक्षिरिति नामधेयः ।

७६. कुथुभिः । कुथुभिधः—कू., प्रधिमः—शिश. ।

७७. सुमन्तुः । महर्षेर्व्यासस्य शिष्यो महाभारते (आदि. ६३।८९,
सभा. ४।११, शान्ति. ४७।५) वर्णितो द्रष्टव्यः ।

७८. जमिनिः । महर्षेर्व्यासस्य शिष्यस्तत्रैव (आदि. ५३।६, ६७।८९,
सभा. ४।११, शान्ति. ४७।६) वर्ण्यते । वर्चरी—कूका., बर्चरिः—शिश.,
बर्चरी—लि. ।

७९. कबन्धः । कुबन्धः—शिवा., सुबन्धुः—वा. ।

८०. कुशिकन्धरः । कुशकन्धरः—शिवा., कुक्षिकन्धरः—शिश. ।

८१. प्लक्षः ।

८२. दार्भायणिः । दाल्भ्यायणिः—लि., दर्वायणिः—कू., दाक्षा-
यणिः—वा. ।

८३. केतुमाली । केतुमान्—शिश. शिवा. कू. कूका. लि. । ८ संख्याकः
शिष्योऽपि केतुमान् । तेनात्र केतुमालीति नाम स्थाप्यते भेदावगमाय ।

८४. गौतमः । गोपनः—लि., बकः—वा. । युधिष्ठिरसभायां बको नाम
ऋषिरासीदिति महाभारते (सभा. ४।११) द्रष्टव्यम् । १४ संख्याक आचार्योऽपि
गौतमः । तेनात्र बक इति नाम स्थापनीयम् ।

८५. भल्लवी । भल्लवः—शिश., भल्लाची—कू., भल्लावी—लि., तुल्याचिः—वा., भल्लापी—कूका., कलापो—कूका. पाठान्तरम् । युधिष्ठिर-सभायां विद्यमानेषु ऋषिषु भालुकिरिति नाम दृश्यते (सभा. ४।१५) । तेन तदेव नामात्र स्वीकर्तव्यम् ।

८६. मधुपिङ्गः । मधुपिङ्गाक्षः—वा. ।

८७. श्वेतकेतुः । उपनिषन्महाभारतादिषु प्रसिद्धो महर्षिः ।

८८. तपोनिधिः । शिवा. शिश. वा. इत्यत्र नाम न दृश्यते । तपोधनः—कू. । ४० संख्याकः शिष्योऽपि तपोधनः । तत्र पाठभेदो नास्तीत्यत्र तपोनिधिरिति नाम स्थापितम् ।

८९. उशिजः । उशिकः—लि. शिश., उषिधा—कू., ऊषिजः—वा. । औशिजनामकः प्राचीनो नृपतिर्मुनिश्च महाभारते (आदि. १।२२६, सभा. ४।१७) वर्ण्यते ।

९०. बृहदश्वः । बृहदुक्थः—वा. कूका, बृहद्रक्षः—कू. । महाभारते बृहदश्वः (वन. २६।२४-२५, ५२।४१-५०), बृहदुक्थः (वन. २२।१८) इति नामद्वयमपि वर्तते ।

९१. देवलः । युधिष्ठिरसभायां राजमानो महर्षिर्महाभारते (सभा. ४।१०) वर्ण्यते ।

९२. कविः । कपिः—कूका. । महर्षेर्भृगोः पुत्रो भारते (आदि. ६६।४२) दृश्यते ।

९३. शालिहोत्रः । मुनिरयं महाभारते (आदि. १५४।१५, १८; वन. ७१।२७, ८३।१०७) इत्यत्र वर्ण्यते : अश्वविद्यायां प्रवीण आसीदयम् ।

९४. अग्निवेशः । अग्निवेशः—शिश. लि., सुवेषः—शिवा. । अग्निवेशः (आदि. १२९।३५-४०, १३८।९), अग्निवेश्यः (वन. २६।२३) इत्युभयमपि नाम भारते दृश्यते ।

९५. युवनाश्वः । युवनाश्वत्रयी भारते वर्णिता शब्दानुकम्पीतो ज्ञातव्या ।

९६. शरद्वसुः । गौतमगोत्रीयो महर्षिः शरद्वान् भारते (आदि. ६३।१०७, १२९।२-२२) वर्णित इतोऽभिन्न एव स्यात् ।

९७. छागलः । श्वेताश्वस्य प्रथमस्याचार्यस्य विवरणं द्रष्टव्यम् । छागलाण्डं नाम ज्ञानेन्द्रियभुवनं शिवागमेषु वर्ण्यते ।

९८. कुण्डकर्णः । कुम्भकर्षाश्वः—वा. । कुण्डनामकः ऋषिरिति (आदि. ५३।८) दृश्यते ।

९९. कुम्भः । कुन्तः—कू., कूष्माण्डः—शिश. ।

१००. प्रवाहकः । प्रवाहुकः—वा., प्रवहकः—कूका. पाठान्तरम् ।

१०१. उलूकः । १०७ संख्याकः शिष्योऽप्येतन्नामक एव । उभयत्रापि पाठान्तरं च न दृश्यते । विश्वामित्रस्य पुत्र एतन्नामक ऋषिर्महाभारते (अनु. ४।५१, शान्ति. ४७।११) वर्ण्यते ।

१०२. विद्युतः । वैद्युतः—वा., कूका. पाठान्तरेऽपि ।

१०३. मण्डूकः । शाद्वलः—कूका., शाद्रकः—कू., शम्बूकः—शिश, शर्वकः—वा. । ४८ संख्याकस्य शिष्यस्य पाठान्तरेषु शर्व इति नाम दृश्यते ।

१०४. आश्वलायनः ।

१०५. अक्षपादः । न्यायदर्शनप्रवर्तक आचार्यः ।

१०६. कणादः । वैशेषिकदर्शनप्रवर्तक आचार्यः । कुमारः—लि. कू. शिश. कूका. ।

१०७. उलूकः । १०१ संख्याकः शिष्योऽप्येतन्नामक एव ।

१०८. वत्सः । वसुवाहनः—कू., वृषवाहनः—कूका पाठान्तरम् ।

१०९. कुशिकः । कुलिकः—शिवा, कुणिकः—कू. । ५७ संख्याकस्य शिष्यस्य कुणिरिति नाम वर्तते । कुशिक ऋषिर्महाभारते (आदि ८।२५, उद्योग. ८३।२७) वर्ण्यते । स लकुलीशशिष्यात् कुशिकाद् भिन्न एव मन्तव्यः, परागभवत्वात् ।

११०. गार्ग्यः । गर्गः—शिश. शिवा. कूका., गर्भः—लि. । ३४ संख्याकः शिष्योऽपि गर्गनामको विद्यत इत्यत्र गार्ग्यं इति मुख्यं नाम स्थापितम् । यद्यपि महाभारते दृश्यते तन्नाम, तथापि लकुलीशशिष्यस्यास्य तद्भ्रान्तैव मन्तव्या ।

१११. मित्रः । मित्रकः—शिवा. वा. कूका. ।

११२. कौरुष्यः । रुष्यः—शिवा., ऋष्यः—कूका., रुः—कू., रुष्टः—वा., तौरुष्यः—शिश. । “श्वेतादयश्च रुष्यान्ता” (शिवा. ९।७) इत्यत्रापि रुष्य इत्येव पाठो दृश्यते ।

एवमत्र २८ योगाचार्याणाम्, ११२ तच्छिष्याणां च परिचयः पर्यवसितः । इतः परं जैनग्रन्थेषु वर्णिता लकुलीशादिविद्यागुर्वन्ता अष्टादशावताराः प्रासङ्गिकतया समुपस्थाप्यन्ते ।

अष्टादशावताराः

हरिभद्रकृतषड्दर्शनसमुच्चयव्याख्यात्रा गुणरत्नेन द्वितीयाधिकारेऽष्टादशावतारा इमे वर्णिता एवम्—“तस्य (ईश्वरस्य) चाष्टादशावतारा अमी—
१. लकुलीशः, २. कौशिकः, ३. गार्ग्यः, ४. मैत्र्यः, ५. कौरुष्यः, ६. ईशानः, ७. पारगार्ग्यः, ८. कमिलाण्डः, ९. मनुष्यकः, १०. कुशिकः, ११. अत्रिः,

१२. पिङ्गलः, १३. पुष्पकः, १४. बृहदार्यः, १५. अगस्तिः, १६. सन्तानः, १७. राशीकरः, १८. विद्यागुरुश्च" इति । राजशेखरकृते षड्दर्शनसमुच्चयेऽपि तान्येतानि नामानि दृश्यन्ते । तत्र १०. अपरकुशिकः, १२. पिङ्गलाक्षः, १४. बृहदाचार्य इति नामसु विशेषः । अन्यत् सर्वं समानम् । पाशुपतसूत्र-प्रस्तावनारम्भेऽपि नामान्येतानि परिगण्यन्ते । तत्र ४. मैत्रेय इति नाम्नि विशेषः । राशीकर एव कौण्डिन्यः पाशुपतसूत्रभाष्यकार इति च तत्र प्रदर्शितम् ।

अत्र नकुलीशोऽन्तिमो योगाचार्यः । कौशिकः, गार्ग्यः, मैत्र्यः, कौश्व इति च तस्य चत्वारः शिष्या इति न केवलं पूर्वोक्तविवरणतः, अपि तु शिला-शासनादिभ्यश्च^१ ज्ञायते । अत्र नाम्नि वैशिष्ट्ये सत्यपि क्रमे नैव वैमत्यम् ।

इदं त्वत्र चिन्तनीयम्—अष्टाविंशतियोगाचार्याणामिव अष्टादशावताराणां क्रमोऽङ्गीकर्तव्यः, उतान्तिमस्य योगाचार्यस्य लकुलीशस्य कुशिकादयश्चत्वारः साक्षाच्छिष्याः स्वीकर्तव्याः । यद्यन्तिमः पक्षः स्वीक्रियते, तर्ह्यन्येषां क्रमः कीदृश इति न निश्चेतुं शक्येत । तेनैवं समाधेयम्—लकुलीशावतारपरम्पराबन्धेषु युगेष्वपि योगाचार्याणां प्रत्येकं महती शिष्यपरम्पराऽवर्तन । तत्र पुराणेषु प्रत्येकं चत्वार एव शिष्या वर्णिताः । ते च न साक्षाच्छिष्याः, किन्तु शिष्यपरम्परा-प्रतीकभूता इति ।

तत्र लकुलीशादिविद्यागुरुर्वन्तानामष्टादशावताराणां क्रमः पुराणामय-शिलाशासनादिभाष्येन स्थिरीकरणीयः । लकुलीशस्य, तस्य चतुर्णां शिष्याणां चोल्लेखः शिलाशासनन्दिरसमुपलब्धे शिलाशासने वर्तते । समरस्य राशी-करस्य कौण्डिन्यापराभिषस्य पाशुपतसूत्रभाष्यं समुपलभ्यते । विद्यागुरुश्च^२ प्रमाणस्तुति-अनुभवस्तोत्ररचयितुर्विद्याधिपतितोऽस्मिन् एव स्यात् । अन्येषां मध्यवर्तिनामवताराणां परिचयः समुपलब्धव्यः ।

श्रुतिषु, पुराणेषु, आगमेषु, चिकित्साशास्त्रेषु च योगाचार्याणां नामानि वर्तितानि च कीर्तितानि स्युः । तेषामन्वेषणे सारस्य स्वादिति विद्या सर्वान्तेषां सारमुक्रमण्या योगाचार्याणां तच्छिष्याणां च नामावली दीयते । पाठान्तराणां समुपलब्धानामशुद्धानां शुद्धानां च सर्वेषां पाठानां समवेष्टाव संकलनं कृतमित्यवधारयम् । कूका. टिप्पणीस्थितानि पाठान्तराणि, अष्टादशावतारानामानि च न सन्त्यन्ते । अत्र आ. इत्यनेन योगाचार्यः, शि. इत्यनेन च तच्छिष्योऽभिधीयते । संख्या च निरुक्तं क्रमं सूचयति ।

१. शिलाशासनादिभाष्ये पाण्डेयविरचितः षड्दर्शनविन्दुरित्याहो अन्योऽयं इत्यर्थः ।

२. विद्यागुरुश्च^२ इति नाम्नः उपोद्घातेऽस्मदीये विद्याधिपतेस्तस्य इत्योः स्थानेऽन्येन ।

योगाचार्याणां तच्छिष्याणां च नामानुक्रमणी

७५ अकाक्षुः (शि.)	७९ कबन्धः (शि.)	७४ कौशल्यः (शि.)
१०५ अक्षपादः (शि.)	८५ कलापी (शि.)	७४ कौशल्यः (शि.)
९४ अग्निवेशः (शि.)	९२ कविः (शि.)	३४ गर्गः (शि.)
९४ अग्निवेशः (शि.)	५० कश्यपः (शि.)	११० गर्गः (शि.)
३६ अङ्गिराः (शि.)	७५ काक्षीवः (शि.)	११० गर्भः (शि.)
२४ अजः (शि.)	५० काश्यपः (शि.)	३४ गार्ग्यः (शि.)
२० अट्टहासः (आ.)	६१ काश्यपः (शि.)	११० गार्ग्यः (शि.)
२४ अण्डजः (शि.)	८० कुक्षिकन्धरः (शि.)	३६ गिरीशः (शि.)
१२ अत्रिः (आ.)	५७ कुणिः (शि.)	१७ गुहावासः (आ.)
५३ अत्रिः (शि.)	१०९ कुणिकः (शि.)	१७ गुहावासी (आ.)
१०४ आश्वलायनः (शि.)	५८ कुणिबाहुः (शि.)	१६ गोकर्णः (आ.)
३० आसुरिः (शि.)	९८ कुण्डकर्णः (शि.)	८४ गोपनः (शि.)
११ उग्रः (आ.)	७६ कुशुभिषः (शि.)	१४ गौतमः (आ.)
५४ उग्रः (शि.)	७६ कुशुमिः (शि.)	८४ गौतमः (शि.)
५४ उग्रतपाः (शि.)	६० कुनेत्रकः (शि.)	२७ घनवाहः (शि.)
६५ उच्चास्यः (शि.)	९९ कुन्तः (शि.)	३७ चलबन्धुः (शि.)
६५ उत्तथ्यः (शि.)	७९ कुबन्धः (शि.)	६३ च्यवनः (शि.)
१०१ उलूकः (शि.)	१०६ कुमारः (शि.)	९७ छगलः (शि.)
१०७ उलूकः (शि.)	९९ कुम्भः (शि.)	१९ जटामाली (आ.)
६२ उशना (शि.)	९८ कुम्भकर्षास्यः (शि.)	१९ जटी माली (आ.)
८९ उशिकः (शि.)	१०९ कुलिकः (शि.)	७ जैगीषव्यः (आ.)
८९ उशिजः (शि.)	८० कुशन्धरः (शि.)	७८ जैमिनिः (शि.)
८९ उषिधा (शि.)	५९ कुशरीरः (शि.)	२५ डिण्डमुण्डीश्वरः (आ.)
८९ ऊषिजः (शि.)	१०९ कुशिकः (शि.)	२५ डिण्डी (आ.)
७ ऋचीकः (शि.)	८० कुशिकन्धरः (शि.)	२५ डिण्डीजुण्डीश्वरः (आ.)
७० ऋचीकः (शि.)	९९ कूष्माण्डः (शि.)	४० तपोधनः (शि.)
९ ऋषभः (आ.)	८ केतुमान् (शि.)	८८ तपोधनः (शि.)
११२ ऋष्यः (शि.)	८३ केतुमान् (शि.)	८८ तपोनिधिः (शि.)
५ कङ्कः (आ.)	८३ केतुमाली (शि.)	३ तारणः (आ.)
५ कङ्कणः (आ.)	३९ केतुशृङ्गः (शि.)	८५ तुल्याचिः (शि.)
१०६ कणादः (शि.)	४४ केशलम्बः (शि.)	११२ तौरुष्यः (शि.)
५२ कपिः (शि.)	११२ कौरुष्यः (शि.)	२५ दण्डी (आ.)
२९ कपिलः (शि.)		२५ दण्डीमुण्डीशः (आ.)

२५ दण्डीमुण्डीश्वरः (आ.)	१०० प्रवाहकः (शि.)	६८ महालयः (शि.)
८ दधिवाहः (आ.)	८१ प्लक्षः (शि.)	१११ मित्रः (शि.)
३ दमनः (आ.)	८४ बकः (शि.)	१११ मित्रकः (शि.)
८२ दर्वायणिः (शि.)	७८ बर्चरी (शि.)	१० मुनिः (आ.)
५४ दवशदः (शि.)	७८ बर्बरिः (शि.)	२६ मेघः (शि.)
८२ दाक्षायणिः (शि.)	७८ बर्बरी (शि.)	२७ मेघवाहः (शि.)
२१ दारुकः (आ.)	३७ बलबन्धुः (शि.)	२६ मोवः (शि.)
२१ दारुणः (आ.)	१३ बलिः (आ.)	१९ यजमाली (आ.)
८२ दार्मायणिः (शि.)	१३ बली (आ.)	७२ यतीश्वरः (शि.)
१७ दालम्ब्यः (शि.)	१३ बालिः (आ.)	९५ युवनाश्वः (शि.)
८२ दाल्म्यायणिः (शि.)	९० बृहदश्वः (शि.)	२६ योगीशः (शि.)
५ दुन्दुभिः (शि.)	९० बृहदुक्थः (शि.)	२४ रवः (शि.)
१६ दुरतिक्रमः (शि.)	९० बृहद्रक्षः (शि.)	७० रुचौकः (शि.)
१५ दुर्गमः (शि.)	६४ बृहस्पतिः (शि.)	११२ रुहः (शि.)
१५ दुर्दमः (शि.)	८५ भल्लवः (शि.)	११२ रुष्टः (शि.)
१५ दुर्दर्भः (शि.)	८५ भल्लवी (शि.)	११२ रुष्यः (शि.)
१४ दुर्मुखः (शि.)	८५ भल्लाची (शि.)	२८ लकुली (आ.)
९१ देवलः (शि.)	८५ भल्लापी (शि.)	२८ लकुलीशः (आ.)
५४ देवसदः (शि.)	८५ भल्लावी (शि.)	२८ लकुलीश्वरः (आ.)
२७ धनवाहः (शि.)	३५ भार्गवः (शि.)	४२ लम्बः (शि.)
१० धर्मः (आ.)	१० भृगुः (आ.)	४४ लम्बकेशकः (शि.)
२८ नकुली (आ.)	१०३ मण्डूकः (शि.)	४३ लम्बाक्षः (शि.)
२८ नकुलीशः (आ.)	३ मदनः (आ.)	४३ लम्बात्मा (शि.)
२८ नकुलीश्वरः (आ.)	८६ मधुपिङ्गः (शि.)	४१ लम्बोदरः (शि.)
३८ नरोमित्रः (शि.)	८६ मधुपिङ्गाक्षः (शि.)	२२ लाङ्गुली (आ.)
३८ निरामित्रः (शि.)	६७ महाकायः (शि.)	२२ लाङ्गुली (आ.)
३१ पञ्चशिखः (शि.)	२३ महाकायमुनिः (शि.)	६ लोकाक्षिः (आ.)
३३ पराशरः (शि.)	२३ महाकालः (आ.)	७५ लोकाक्षिः (शि.)
१२ पापनाशनः (शि.)	६७ महाकालः (शि.)	७५ लोकाक्षी (शि.)
१२ पाशनाशनः (शि.)	६८ महानिलः (शि.)	६ लोकाख्यः (आ.)
७६ प्रधिमः (शि.)	६८ महानिलिः (शि.)	६ लौगाक्षिः (आ.)
१०० प्रबाहुकः (शि.)	६८ महाबलः (शि.)	७५ लौगाक्षिः (शि.)
४२ प्रलम्बकः (शि.)	२३ महायाममुनिः (शि.)	१०८ वत्सः (शि.)
१०० प्रवर्हकः (शि.)	६७ महायोगः (शि.)	५१ वार्षिष्ठः (शि.)

५१ वसिष्ठः (शि.)	२३ शङ्खः (शि.)	३ श्वेतास्यः (शि.)
२७ वसुवाहः (शि.)	२३ शङ्खपाद् (शि.)	७२ संयताश्वकः (शि.)
१०८ वसुवाहनः (शि.)	२३ शङ्खवाणी (शि.)	२३ संयमी (आ.)
३२ वाग्बलिः (शि.)	६ शतरूपः (शि.)	२३ सञ्जयः (शि.)
६९ वाचस्त्रवाः (शि.)	१०३ शम्बूकः (शि.)	४८ सत्यः (शि.)
६९ वाचःश्रवा (शि.)	९६ शरद्वसुः (शि.)	१८ सनः (शि.)
६९ वाजःश्रवा (शि.)	४८ शर्वः (शि.)	१८ सनकः (शि.)
६६ वामदेवः (शि.)	१०३ शर्वकः (शि.)	१७ सनत्कुमारः (शि.)
३२ वाष्कलः (शि.)	१०३ शाद्रकः (शि.)	१९ सनन्दः (शि.)
५१ वासिष्ठः (शि.)	१०३ शाद्वलः (शि.)	१९ सनन्दनः (शि.)
१० विकेशः (शि.)	१२ शापनाशनः (शि.)	२० सनातनः (शि.)
९ विकोशः (शि.)	९३ शालिहोत्रः (शि.)	१३ सबालकः (आ.)
४३ विक्रोशः (शि.)	३२ शाल्वलः (शि.)	४६ समबुद्धिः (शि.)
२४ विजयः (शि.)	२ शिखः (शि.)	४८ सर्वः (शि.)
१०२ विद्युतः (शि.)	१८ शिखण्डधृक् (आ.)	४५ सर्वज्ञः (शि.)
११ विपापः (शि.)	१८ शिखण्डभृत् (आ.)	२६ सविष्णुः (आ.)
११ विपाशः (शि.)	१८ शिखण्डी (आ.)	२६ सहिष्णुः (आ.)
२२ विरजः (शि.)	२४ शूली (आ.)	४७ साध्यः (शि.)
२२ विरजाः (शि.)	७१ श्यावकः (शि.)	२५ सारस्वतः (शि.)
५२ विरजाः (शि.)	७१ श्यावाश्वः (शि.)	७० सुकेशः (शि.)
११ विशाखः (शि.)	७१ श्यावास्यः (शि.)	४ सुगोत्रः (आ.)
११ विशापः (शि.)	५५ श्रवणः (शि.)	३ सुतारः (शि.)
१० विशेषः (शि.)	५६ श्रविष्कटः (शि.)	२१ सुधामा (शि.)
९ विशोकः (शि.)	५६ श्रविष्टकः (शि.)	४९ सुधामा (शि.)
९ वृषभः (आ.)	५६ श्रविष्ठकः (शि.)	७० सुधीकः (शि.)
१०८ वृषवाहनः (शि.)	५५ श्रावणः (शि.)	७२ सुपथीश्वरः (शि.)
१५ वेददर्शी (आ.)	१ श्वेतः (आ.)	७२ सुपरथीश्वरः (शि.)
१५ वेदशिराः (आ.)	२३ श्वेतः (आ.)	१३ सुपालकः (आ.)
१५ वेदशीर्णः (आ.)	१ श्वेतः (शि.)	७० सुपीकः (शि.)
१५ वेदशीर्षः (आ.)	८७ श्वेतकेतुः (शि.)	७९ सुबन्धुः (शि.)
१५ वेदशीर्षाः (आ.)	४ श्वेतलोहितः (शि.)	१३ सुबालकः (आ.)
१०२ वैद्युतः (शि.)	२ श्वेतशिखः (शि.)	२ सुभानः (आ.)
२४ वैरजः (शि.)	२ श्वेतशिखण्डी (शि.)	७७ सुमन्तुः (शि.)
३२ वसेतुः (शि.)	३ श्वेताश्वः (शि.)	१३ सुमुखः (शि.)

JULY, 1982]

पुराणवर्णिताः पाशुपता योगाचार्याः .

21

२६ सुमेधः (शि.)

२८ सुवाहकः (शि.)

२८ सुवाहनः (शि.)

७० सुवीरः (शि.)

९४ सुवेषः (शि.)

५६ सुवैद्यकः (शि.)

४ सुहोत्रः (आ.)

४ सुहोत्री (आ.)

२७ सोमशर्मा (आ.)

७३ हिरण्यनाभः (शि.)

७३ हिरण्यनामा (शि.)

७ हृषीकः (शि.)



आंग्लभाषामयानां निबन्धानां संक्षेपाः

THE DIVINE PRESENCE IN THE MŪRTI ACCORDING TO
THE PURĀṆAS

by

Pinuccia Caracchi

पौराणिकदृष्ट्या मूर्तो (= प्रतिमायां) देवताया विद्यमानता

हिन्दूधर्मसंमता देवमूर्तिपूजा पाश्चात्यै विचारकैः 'जडवस्तु-पूजाविशेष-रूपा' इति चिन्तिता प्राक्; कुमारस्वामिप्रभृतिभिर्विद्वद्भिः कृतानां ग्रन्थानामध्ययनेन मतमिदमिदानीं परिवर्तितं संजातम् । न खलु जडा मूर्तिः पूज्यते, प्रत्युत मूर्तौ (अर्थात् मूर्तिद्वारेण) ऐश-सत्तायाः पूजनं क्रियते-इत्येव इदानीमभ्युपगम्यते । मूर्तिरीश्वरचिन्तने साहायकमादधाति; न खलु कश्चित् 'मूर्तिरेव ईश्वरः' इति चिन्तयति । अतएव मूर्तौ देवताया आवाहनं क्रियते, पूजानन्तरं च तस्या विसर्जनमपि । आवाहन-विसर्जन-क्रिययोः किमपि गूढं फलं मूर्तौ प्रकटितं भवति—इति विज्ञेयम् । अस्य रहस्यं बहुधा व्याख्यातं अवेलन—प्रभृतिभिः आधुनिकैर्व्याख्यातृभिरपि । न खलु आवाहन-विसर्जनक्रिये मूर्तौ कमपि वास्तवं परिणामम् आधत्तः प्रत्युतोपासकस्य मन एव तत्तत्क्रियया प्रभावितं भवति—इति बहवो मन्यन्ते । विषयेऽस्मिन् किं मतं शास्त्रदृष्ट्या युक्तमिति विस्तरेणालोचितं लेखिकया । आवाहनविसर्जनक्रियाभ्यां मूर्तौ कश्चन निगूढोऽलौकिकः परिणामः (Mystical transformation) उत्पद्यते-इति निबन्धान्ते स्फुटं प्रदर्शितम् ।

पुराणागमतन्त्रादिषु मूर्तिविषयकाणि (मूर्तिनिर्माणादिपराणि) बहूनि मतानि दृश्यन्ते । प्राधान्येन पुराणमतान्याश्रित्यैवात्र विचारः कृतः । कुमारस्वामि—अवेलनमतयोः समर्थनमेव पुराणवचनेषु दृश्यते । विष्णुधर्मोत्तर—विष्णु-गण्ड-भागवत-परमसंहिता-प्रश्नसंहिता—वचनानि स्वमतपुष्टयेऽत्र उदाहृतानि ।

लेखिकयेदं दर्शितं यद् अमूर्ते देवे चित्तस्य समाधानाय मूर्तिसाहाय्यमादौ स्वीकार्यमेव; साधनस्य चरमदशायां न मूर्तिपूजाया अपेक्षा भवतीति चात्र व्यक्तमेव प्रतिपादितम् । स्वयोग्यतानुसारेण शिवादिदेवता उपासनीयाः-इत्यप्युद्बोधितम् ।

इदमप्यत्र विचारितम्—न निर्गुणं ब्रह्म प्रतिमादिषु उपास्यते प्रत्युत शिवादय ऐश्वर्यवन्तो देवाः, ये स्वैश्वर्यबलेन मूर्तिषु आविशन्ति । इमे देवा अपि तत्त्वदृष्ट्या ब्रह्माण एवाविर्भावविशेषाः, अतएव ब्रह्म मूर्तममूर्तं चोच्यते । न खलु साकाराणि जडवस्तून्त्येव मूर्तिशब्देनाभिलप्यन्ते, प्रत्युत ससीमाविर्भावविशेषाः, परिच्छिन्नाभिव्यक्तिविशेषा वा मूर्तिशब्देन ग्राह्याः । इमे प्रायेणावतारा इत्युच्यन्ते, येषां विवरणं विस्तरेणोपलभ्यते पुराणेषु ।

यतो हि मूर्ति-साहायकेन परस्यात्मन उपासनं क्रियते, अतो मूर्ति-निर्माणादिकमधिकृत्य पुराणागमादिशास्त्रकारैर्बहुधा चिन्तितम्—कस्य देवस्य कीदृशी मूर्तिः कथं कैद्वयै निर्मेया; क च सा कथं स्थापनीया, कार्भवा प्रक्रियाभिः पूजनीयेति ।

निबन्धेऽस्मिन् आवाहन-विसर्जन-प्राणप्रतिष्ठाश्चाधिकृत्य विशिष्टो विचारः कृतो लेखिकया, न्यासाधिवासनादिकर्मणां लघु विवरणमपि प्रदत्तम् । मूर्तीनां चलादिभेदा अपि उक्ताः—‘नामनामिनोरभेदः’ इति सिद्धान्तमाश्रित्य जपो विधेय इत्यप्युक्तम् । मन्दिरस्थितस्य मूर्तस्य देवस्य पूजां कुर्वतो जनस्य इयं मतिरपि जायते यद् आत्मनो देवस्याधिष्ठानभूतमिदं शरीरमन्दिरमिति । मूर्ती देवताया उपस्थिति र्वादृशी सा न वर्णयितुं शक्यते—इत्युपसंहृतं लेखिकया ।

प्रसंगत इमे विषया इह विवेचिताः—दृष्टदेवतास्वरूपम्; योगिदृष्टि-भक्तदृष्ट्योर्भेदः; दोषयुक्तायाः पूजाया असाफल्यम्; वैदिक—तान्त्रिक-मिश्रभेदेन उपासना-त्रैविध्यम्; मन्त्रशक्तिश्च ।

THE ROLE OF FOUR VARNAS DURING THE TIME OF NĪLĀDRIMAHODAYAM

by

Vidyut Lata Ray

नीलाद्रिमहोदयग्रन्थरचनासमये चतुर्णां वर्णानां प्रभावकर्माणि

नीलाद्रिमहोदयं नाम एकनवत्यध्यायात्मकं किमपि स्थलपुराणं (तीर्थ-विशेषमाहात्म्यविवरणप्रधानं) विद्यते । पुराणमिदं स्कन्दपुराणीय—पुरुषोत्तम-माहात्म्यखण्डम् अनुकरोतीति दृश्यते । स्त्रीष्ट्रीय-चतुर्दश-शतके विरचितमिद-मित्यनुमीयते । पुराणेऽस्मिन् जगन्नाथमाहात्म्यादि-विवरणेन सह तात्कालिक-समाजस्य चित्रणमपि कृतमिति दृश्यते ।

एतत्पुराणोक्तं यत् सामाजिकं विवरणं तद् निबन्धेऽस्मिन् लेखिकया प्रदर्शितम् । इमे विषया अत्र मुख्यत उक्ताः—समाजस्य द्विधा विभागो राज-प्रजात्मकः; प्रजानां बाहुल्येन धर्मपरायणत्वम्, तासां स्वधर्मनिरतत्वं च; चण्डालजातेः सामाजिकी स्थितिः; केषां जगन्नाथमूर्तिस्पर्शनेऽधिकारः; के खलु समाजे प्रशंसिता मान्याश्च भवन्ति; वर्णसंकरस्य स्वरूपम्; ब्राह्मणस्य माहात्म्यं कर्माणि, भेदाश्च; उपनयनादिसंस्काराः; पुरोहितानां विशिष्टमर्यादा; क्षत्रियाणां धर्माः (कर्माणि), ब्राह्मणैः सह तेषां संबन्धः; क्षत्रिय-इन्द्रद्युम्न-नृपतिविषयिणी चर्चा; ब्राह्मणक्षत्रिययो रन्तरङ्गः संबन्धः; वैश्यानां धर्माः, शूद्रेरनाचरणोयानि कर्माणि; शबराणां यवनानां च कर्माणि, तेषां वासस्थानानि च ।

मुख्यविचारप्रसंगे इमे अवान्तरविषया अपि आलोचिताः—वैदिको वर्णव्यवस्था कर्महेतुकी; जन्ममूलिका वर्णव्यवस्था स्मृतिशास्त्रसिद्धा अर्वाक्-कालिकी; जगन्नाथप्रसादग्रहणे प्राणिनामधिकारभेदस्य अभावः; ब्राह्मणानामेव प्रतिग्रहेऽधिकार इति ।

पुराणारम्भे नैमिषोयमुनिप्रसंगो दृश्यते । तीर्थतत्त्वस्य व्याख्यानाय सूनी मुनिभिः पृष्टः; सूतेन च प्रसंगानुप्रसंगत उपर्युक्ता विषयाः प्रतिपादिताः ।

THE SYAMANTAKA GEM STORY : A STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS

by

Ivan Strenski

स्यमन्तकमण्युपाख्यान-रचनाविन्यासस्य विश्लेषणम्

निबन्धास्यारम्भे लेखकेन पुराणसामान्यविषये पुराणसंख्याविषये च लघ्वी चर्चा कृता । केषाञ्चन पुराणानां रचनाकालविषयेऽपि स्वमतं प्रकटीकृतम्, विष्णुपुराणमधिकृत्य विशिष्टा चर्चापि कृता ।

स्यमन्तकमणि-कथा यथा विष्णुपुराणे प्रोक्ता, तथा ततोऽर्वाक्कालिके भागवतेऽपि । प्राचीनपुराणेषु अन्यतमे मत्स्यपुराणेऽपि कथ्येयं वर्तते । तथैव प्राचीनतरे वायुपुराणे महाभारतेऽपि । यद्यपि कथाया अस्या मुख्यं रूपं सर्वत्र सदृशमेव, तथापि गौणेषु अंशेषु भेदो दृश्यते विभिन्नेषु पुराणेषु । यथा—वायु-पुराणीया कथा नांशतो विष्णुपुराणमनुसरति, अनुसरति च महाभारतीयां कथाम् ।

स्यमन्तकमणिकथारचनाविन्यासविश्लेषणे लेखकेन केषांचन पाश्चात्य-विदुषाम् (यथा लेबी स्ट्रीस्, टी. मूर, ई. आर. लीच इति नामधेयानाम्) आलोचनारीतिरनुसृता ।

अस्याः कथाया ये अवान्तरविभागा भवितुमर्हन्ति, ते आदौ दर्शिताः । विभागेषु प्रत्येकमाश्रित्य लेखकेन विचारः कृतः । इमे खलु विभागाः—

(१) सूर्येण सत्राजिते मणिः प्रदत्तः । (२) कृष्णभयात् सत्राजित् स्वभ्रात्रे प्रसेनाय मणिं दत्तवान् । दुष्टोऽयं सिंहेन हतः, जाम्बवता च सिंहो हतः, मणिश्च लब्धः । (३) कृष्णेन सह जाम्बवतो युद्धम् । (४) कृष्णेन मणिः प्राप्तः । (५) कृष्णः सत्राजिते मणिं दत्तवान् । सत्राजित्कन्यया सत्यभामया सह कृष्णस्य विवाहो जातः । (६) कृष्णेन सह सत्यभामया विवाहे जाते कृतवर्मादि-यादवा रुष्टा जाताः । रुष्टः शतधन्वा सत्राजितं जघान । (७) वारणावते पाण्डवा दग्धा इति श्रुत्वा कृष्णो वारणावतं प्रस्थितः । (८) सत्यभामया कृष्णो विज्ञापितं वारणावते—शतधन्वना सत्राजितो हतो मणिश्च गृहीत इति । (९) शतधन्वना मणिरक्रूराय प्रदत्तः । यद्यपि कृष्णेन हतः शतधन्वा, तथापि तेन मणिर्न प्राप्तः । मणिविषये कृष्णं प्रति बलरामस्य संशयः, अप्रसन्नचित्तस्य तस्यान्यत्र गमनम् । (१०) मणियुतोऽक्रूरः यज्ञानुष्ठानपरायणो बभूव, तदधिष्ठिता द्वारका समङ्गला जाता । (११) 'अक्रूरे मणिरस्ति' इति कृष्णो ज्ञातवान् । तेन पृष्ठः स मणिं सभायां प्रदर्शितवान् । कृष्णो मणिर्न गृहीतवान्, अतोऽक्रूरो मणिं कण्ठे विधार्य सूर्यं इव तेजस्वी जातः ।

प्रत्येकं विभागेषु बहवोऽवान्तराः कथाः सन्ति । सर्वासां कथानां स्वरूपं कथान्तःपातिनां जनानां चरितं च विस्तरेण निबन्धे प्रदर्शितम् ।

किविधो राजनैतिको धार्मिको वा हेतुः प्रत्येकं घटनानामुद्भावको भवति, कस्य उद्देश्यस्य पूर्तये कः किं कर्म (विशेषतः मणि-दानरूपं कर्म, मणिग्रहणरूपं कर्म वा) संपादयति— इति विस्तरेण प्रदर्शितमस्मिन् लेखे । सात्त्वतवंशीयानां यादवानां काचिद् विशिष्टा राज्यव्यवस्थाऽसीत्, सभा च । सम्येषु कृष्णो बलवत्तरः । विरोधिनः सम्याः कृष्णेन सह कथं विरोधं चक्रुः—इत्यनया कथया स्फुटं विज्ञायते । कृष्णेन सह यादवान्तराणां यो विरोध आसीत्, स एतत्कथाया मूलमिति व्यक्तं प्रतीयते ।

अस्याः कथायाः पर्यालोचनेन कृष्णचरितस्य महत्ता विज्ञाना भवति । अक्रूरो न कृष्णस्य मित्रम्, तथापि तस्मै एव मणिर्दत्तः कृष्णेन—इत्यनेन कृष्णस्य माहात्म्यं सुप्रतिष्ठितं भवति ।

THE VĀYUPURĀṆA AND THE MĀRKANDEYA PURĀṆA :
A COMPARATIVE STUDY

by

Lallanji Gopal

वायु-मार्कण्डेय-पुराणयोस्तुलनात्मकमध्ययनम्

सर्गादिपञ्चविषय-बहिर्भूता अपि विषयाः प्राचीनकालादेव पुराणेषु संकलिताः । यथा यथा विद्यानां विकाशा जाताः, तथा तथा तेषां संग्रहोऽपि पुराणेषु कृतः । विभिन्नानां धर्मदर्शनसंप्रदायानाम् आचारा मतानि च पुराणेषु यथाकालं प्रतिपादितानि । योगशास्त्रीयम् अरिष्टविषयम् कतिपय-पुराणप्रतिपादितम् अधिकृत्य प्राक्तने निबन्धे ('पुराण'-प्रकाशिते) लेखकेन विचारः कृतः । वायु-मार्कण्डेय-पुराण-द्वय-गतम् अरिष्टविषयम् अधिकृत्येह विचारः प्रस्तूयते । तुलनाप्रधानोऽयं विचारः ।

विषयेऽस्मिन् इमानि मतानि लेखकेन प्रतिपादितानि—(१) सन्ति कानिचन अरिष्टविषयकाणि मतानि यानि एकस्मिन्नेव पुराणे उक्तानि, न द्वयोः । (२) पुराणद्वयवचनेषु बहुत्र शब्द-सादृश्यमवलोक्यते; बहूनि वचनानि सर्वथैकरूपाणि । (३) केषुचित् स्थलेषु अर्थैक्ये सत्यपि पर्यायशब्दप्रयोगे भेदो दृश्यते (यथा वह्निस्थले पावक इति) । (४) वाक्यानां पौर्वापर्ये नोभयत्र एकरूपता-वलोक्यते । (५) एकस्मिन् पुराणे यद् अस्पष्टार्थकम् अधिकम् अप्रयोजनं दुष्कृतं पूरणसापेक्षं वा, तस्य तथा परिवर्तनम् अन्यस्मिन् पुराणे कृतं यथा स दोषो दूरीकृतो भवेत् । (६) केषुचित् स्थलेषु लिपिकरप्रमादा अपि जाताः ।

पुराणद्वयगतयोरनयोविवरणयो रूपजीव्योजीवकभावो न निश्चेतुं शक्यते । उभयोः किमपि स्वतन्त्रम् एकं मूलमासीदित्येव संभाव्यते ।

पुराणद्वयरचनाकालमधिकृत्यापि लेखकेन स्वमतं प्रकटीकृतम् । लेखकेन पर्जितर-हाजरा-अग्रवाल-प्रभृतिविदुषां मतानि प्रदर्शितानि समीक्षितानि च । मार्कण्डेयपुराणगतारिष्टविवरणपरकोऽध्यायः, वायुपुराणगतारिष्टपरकोऽध्यायश्च ख्रीष्टीये चतुर्थे शतके विरचितौ-इति लेखकीया दृष्टिः । मार्कण्डेयपुराणोक्त-विवरणस्य प्रभावो वायुपुराणगतविवरणे वर्तते—इति यद् हाजरा-मतं तन्न लेखकेनाभ्युपगतम् । अरिष्टविवरणस्य प्राचीनतमं मूलं देवलधर्मसूत्रे महाभारते चोपलभ्यते—इति विज्ञेयम् ।

निबन्धस्यान्ते—'मूलभूतं पुराणम्, तस्य च यथाकालमुपबृंहणपूर्वकं पुराणान्तराणां विरचनम्' इत्यादिविषयानधिकृत्य लेखकेन विशदं विवेचितम्, वायुपुराणस्य महाभारतादपि प्राचीनता प्रदर्शिता ।

THE COLOPHONS OF THE CRITICALLY EDITED
PURĀṆAS

by

Giorgio Bonazzoli

समीक्षात्मक-संस्करणवतां पुराणानां पुष्पिकाः

ग्रन्थः खल्वध्याय-सर्गादिभिर्विभक्तो भवति । अध्याय-सर्गादि-समाप्ते रनन्तरं अध्याय-सर्गादि-प्रतिपादितानां विषयाणां ज्ञापकं यद् वाक्यम् 'इति' पदघटितं दृश्यते, तदेव 'पुष्पिका' इत्युच्यते । पुष्पिकावाक्यं यथा काव्यादिषु दृश्यते, तथा पुराणेष्वपि । प्रायेण पुष्पिकावाक्ये ग्रन्थनाम्नः, अध्यायसंख्यायाः, प्रधानाप्रधानविषयादीनां च समुल्लेखो वर्तते ।

पुष्पिकावाक्यसम्पादने प्रायेण पुराणसंपादका उपेक्षका भवन्ति । समीक्षात्मकपुराणग्रन्थसंपादका अपि पुष्पिकावाक्यसंपादने शैथिल्यं भजन्ते— इति दृश्यते । संपादकाः स्वयमेव पुष्पिकावाक्यं विरच्य ग्रन्थे स्थापयन्ति— इत्यपि लक्षितं क्वचित् । पुष्पिका-लेखने लिपिकराणाम् प्रमादा अपि दृष्टाः । सन्ति ईदृशानि पुष्पिकावाक्यानि, येषां प्रामाण्यविषयेऽपि संशयो जागर्ति ।

निबन्धेऽस्मिन् लेखकेन समीक्षात्मकसंस्करणवतां त्रयाणां पुराणानाम् (वामन-कूर्म-वराह-नामकानाम्) पुष्पिका आश्रित्य विचारः कृतः ।

निबन्धस्य प्रथमांशे पुष्पिकागतान् अध्यायादि-संख्या-परक-निर्देशान् अधिकृत्य विचारः प्रस्तुतः । अत्रापि यथाक्रमम् (क) नवीनसंख्याया निर्देशः (पूर्वप्रचलिताध्याय-संख्यानिर्देशं परित्यज्य नवीनसंख्याया प्रयोगः), (ख) द्विधा अध्यायसंख्यायाः निर्देशः (ग) अध्यायगणनाया विच्छेदः, (घ) अध्यायसंख्यानिर्देशे पुनरुक्तिः, (ङ) एकस्मिन् हस्तलेखे स्वविभागान्तःपातिनां विभागान्तरान्तःपातिनां वा हस्तलेखान्तराणां प्रभावः, (च) प्रकीर्णा विचाराश्च—इतीमे विषया बहुभिरुदाहरणैर्विचारिताः ।

विचारप्रसंगे लेखकेन यानि विशिष्टानि मतानि प्रोक्तानि तेषु कानिचनेह प्रदर्श्यन्ते—

द्विविभागविशिष्टे कूर्मपुराणे केषुचिद् हस्तलेखेषु अध्यायसंख्याया अविभागो दृश्यते (कृत्स्ने ग्रन्थे धारावाहिकरूपेण अध्यायसंख्या प्रदत्ता) । धारावाहिक-संख्यानिर्देशेन सह नवीनसंख्यानिर्देशोऽपि क्वचित् कृतः । यथा वराहपुराणगते मथुरामाहात्म्ये पृथग्रूपेणाध्यायसंख्या प्रदत्ता केषुचिद् हस्तलेखेषु । इदं निर्देशाधिक्यमपि न सर्वेषु हस्तलेखेषु सर्वग्रन्थव्यापि लक्ष्यते । पुराणग्रन्थलिपिकरैरेव संख्यानिर्देश ईदृशं वैचित्र्यं कृतमिति न तर्कसहम् ।

अध्यायसंख्याया द्विनिर्देशः कश्चित्कः । कूर्मपुराणे अस्या रीतेः कानिचनो-
दाहरणानि लभ्यन्ते । उदाहरणानामल्पीयस्त्वाद् एतद्वीतिविषये न किमपि वैशद्येन
विचारयितुं शक्यते ।

पुराणग्रन्थे कृत्स्नायाः पुष्पिकाया योऽभावः, पुष्पिकायामध्यायस्य वा
योऽनुल्लेखः, अनयोः कारणेषु लिपिकरप्रमादः मुख्यतां भजते-इति कथनं नासंगतं
भवति । पुराणगता अध्यायविशेषाः कदा संयोजिता वियोजिता वा- इति एवं-
विधपुष्पिकानामध्ययनेन अनुमातुं शक्यते । को हस्तलेखः कस्मिन् विभागे
स्थापनीयः—इत्यपि आभिर्विज्ञातुं शक्यते । अध्यायसंख्यानिर्देशे कश्चित् शब्द-
सादृश्यहेतुकी भ्रान्तिरपि जाता लिपिकराणामित्यपि दृश्यते ।

अध्यायसंख्यानिर्देशे पुनरुक्तिः खलु लिपिकरप्रमादात् प्राक्तन-भ्रान्तनिर्देश-
संशोधनकरणाद् वा संजातेति व्यक्तं प्रतीयते । कश्चित् 'हस्तलेखस्य प्राचीनं रूपं
कोदृशम् आसीत्' इत्यपि पुनरुक्तिपर्यालोचनेन प्रतीयते ।

एकस्मिन् हस्तलेखे हस्तलेखान्तराणां यः प्रभावः, स वामनपुराणीय-
सरोमहात्म्याध्ययनेन स्फुटं विज्ञायते—इति प्रदर्शित लेखकेन ।

अन्तिमायां पुष्पिकायां हस्तलेखस्य रचनाकालादिविषयिणी सूचना
विद्यते । पुराणगतानि बहूनि विचित्राणि तथ्यानि अन्तिम-पुष्पिकाध्ययनेन
ज्ञातुं शक्यन्ते । अस्यां पुष्पिकायामपि लिपिकर-प्रमादा दृश्यन्ते; पूर्वतन-
लिपिकरकृता प्रमादा अर्वाक्कालिक-लिपिकरेणानुसृताः— इत्यप्यवलोक्यते ।

निबन्धस्य द्वितीयेश्चे ता समस्या विचारिता याः पुष्पिकागतेषु पुराण-
पुराणाध्याययोर्नामसु दृष्टाः । पुष्पिकागतेऽध्यायनामनिर्देशे वैचित्र्यं दृश्यते—
कश्चित् सप्तमीविभक्तेः कश्चिद् वा प्रथमाविभक्तेः प्रयोगः कृतः; कश्चित्
प्रकरणद्वयनामापि गृहीतम्—'रुद्रगीतासु भुवनकोशे' इति । पुराणस्य कियानंशः
प्राचीनः, प्राचीनतरो वा—इति पुष्पिकागत-पुराण-पुराणाध्याययोर्नामनो दृष्ट्वा
अनुमातुं शक्यते ।

पुष्पिकोक्त-पुराणनामनिर्देशे भिन्नताऽवलोक्यते; यथा 'आदि-' पद-
प्रयोगः पुराणनाम्ना सह कश्चिद् दृश्यते, कश्चिन्नेति । पुराणावान्तरभागानां
निर्देशेऽपि वैचित्र्यं दृश्यते । कूर्मपुराणस्य पूर्वभागः सदैव पूर्वभाग इत्युच्यते,
उत्तरभागस्तु उत्तरखण्ड इति, उत्तरार्ध इति उपरिभाग इति उपरिविभाग इति
वा शब्दै रभिलप्यते । अनेन सूच्यते यद् उभौ भागौ नैकस्मात् पुराणसंप्रदायादागतौ ।
कश्चित् पुष्पिकायां सविशेषणमपि पुराणनाम दृश्यते । तच्चापि न कृत्स्न-पुराण-
व्यापि । कश्चित् पुष्पिकायां विशेषणपदे परिवर्तनमपि लक्ष्यते । यथा कूर्मपुराणे
पुष्पिकायां 'षट्साहस्रिकायां संहितायाम्' इति, 'वैयासिक्यां संहितायाम्' इति च
पठ्यते विभिन्नेषु हस्तलेखेषु । अनेन सूच्यते यत् पुराणस्य पूर्वकालिकं रूपम्
अपरकालिकं च न सर्वथा अभिन्नम् ।

लेखकेनेन सुबुद्धं प्रतिपादितं यत् न केवलं पुराणग्रन्थरचनाविषये बहूनि
ध्यानि पुष्पिकाः सूचयन्ति, प्रस्युत 'कः सल्लु कस्य पुराणस्य भादिसोऽप्यायः
सर्वादौ प्रतिपादनीयो विषयः)' 'प्रथमाध्याय-विषयस्य प्रतिपादनं स्वराजान्
ध्यावितं न वा' इत्येते विषया अपि पुष्पिकाध्ययनेन अनुमानुमर्शः । अतः
नाम्न पुष्पिका अनवधानेन विरचिता इति नापलपनीयम् अतः पुष्पिकायाः
रीक्षणं कृत्वैव तासां अध्ययनं विधेयम् ।

BUDDHA AS DEPICTED IN THE PURĀNAS

by

Ram Shankar Bhattacharyu

पुराणवर्णितो बुद्धः

पुराणेषु (उपपुराणेषु महाभारते च) भगवतो बुद्धस्य विषये यानि
वचनानि उपलभ्यन्ते तानि आधित्य निबन्धोऽयं विरचिनः । एषु वचनेषु
बुद्धस्य चरितमधिकृत्य यद् विशिष्टं मतमुक्तं तद्विह तन्त्र—बौद्ध वाङ्मयादि-
मतप्रदर्शनेन सह विचारितम् । रामायणोक्तं बुद्धपरकं वचनं न सिद्धायबुद्ध
लक्षयति—इति लेखकीया दृष्टिः ।

निबन्धे इमानि वस्तूनि विधेयतो विचारितानि—बुद्धस्य विषय-
त्वम्; बुद्धावतारविषये पुराणस्य दृष्टिः; अवतारगणनायां बुद्धस्य स्थानम्, बुद्धस्य
संनिधत्वं संन्यासित्वं च; बुद्धस्य पितरौ, पत्नी, पुत्रश्च; बुद्धस्य शरीरम्, बुद्ध-
प्रयुक्ता भाषा; बुद्धकृतानि कर्माणि; बुद्धसंबद्धानि स्थानानि; बुद्धस्य काकः
बुद्धस्य जन्मतिथिः; बुद्धस्य पूजा; बुद्धस्य पूर्वजायाः; बुद्धसंबन्ध-जाक्यो-
पाख्यस्याभिप्रायः ।

उपर्युक्तेषु विषयेषु यानि पौराणिकानि मतानि न तानि सर्वान् एकमेव
बुद्धनामकं पुरुषं लक्षयन्ति, यतो बुद्धजन्मादि-परकेषु पुराणवचनेषु न सर्वत्र
एकमस्य वृत्तये—इति लेखकेनोक्तम् । बुद्धशब्दः पुराणेषु योगार्थेऽपि (ज्ञान-
शाखाविषु अर्थेषु) प्रयुक्त उपलभ्यते, इति लेखकेन दर्शितम् । इदमपि बोध क्य
कश्चित् सिद्धायबुद्धोक्ताद् मताद् प्राचीनतरम् अवैदिकमतम् अपि बौद्धग्रन्थेन
पुराणेषु लक्षितम् ।

पुराणोक्तमतानां विषयीकरणाय लेखकेन बहुत प्रयत्नितम् । लेखक प्रति-
पादितं यत्—पुराणकारैर्भगवत्भावेति रूपेण यत्कं नत् पाणिभाषेण बुद्धेन न
वैदिकज्ञानकाण्डस्य गर्हणं कृतम्, प्रस्युत हिंसामयकर्मणामेव बुद्धस्य पुराणमहि-
कालो न सर्वथा कारुणिकः; कश्चित् पुराणोक्तो बुद्धकालो न मुष् उपपादनाह ।
उपनिषत्सु बुद्धः स्मृतो न वा, बुद्धेन राज्यश्रीर्भुक्ता न वा; बुद्धेन वे संहितस्य
मनुष्या वा दैत्य-दानवा वा—इत्यादयः केचन प्रश्ना अपि समाहिता लेखकेन ।

सर्वभारतीय-काशिराजन्यासस्य कार्यविवरणम्

(जनवरी—जून १९८२)

वराहपुराणसंबन्धि कार्यम्

वराहपुराणस्य पाठसमीक्षितसंस्करणम् आंग्लभाषानुवादश्च प्रकाशितौ । अस्य हिन्दीभाषानुवादोऽपि कृतः । संप्रति अस्यानुवादस्य संपादनं संशोधनं च क्रियते । हिन्दीभाषानुवादोऽयं शीघ्रमेव मुद्रणार्थं दास्यते ।

गरुडपुराणसंबन्धि कार्यम्

गरुडपुराणस्य चतुर्णां हस्तलेखानां पाठसंवाद-लेखनकार्यं च संपूर्णं जातम् । एषु चतुर्षु हस्तलेखेषु द्वौ रामनगरदुर्गस्थ-सरस्वतीभण्डारपुस्तकालयस्य; द्वौ च पुण्यपत्तननगरस्थ-भण्डारकर-प्राच्यविद्या-शोध-संस्थानस्य । सरस्वती-भण्डारस्यैकस्मिन् हस्तलेखे गरुडपुराणस्य त्रयः खण्डाः—पूर्वखण्डः, उत्तर-खण्डः (प्रेतकल्पापरनामा), ब्रह्मखण्डश्च दृश्यन्ते । एशियाटिकसोसायटी (कलकत्ता)—ढाकाविश्वविद्यालय—बोडलियनपुस्तकालय (अक्सफोर्ड)—दुविन्गेन-विश्वविद्यालय (पश्चिमजर्मनी)—इत्येतेभ्यः संस्थानेभ्यो हस्तलेखानामवाप्तये प्रयासो विधीयते ।

वेवपारायणम्

रामनगरदुर्गस्थिते व्यासेश्वरमन्दिरे माघमासे शुक्लपक्षे शुक्लयजुर्वेद-संहितायाः पारायणं कृतं श्रीमहादेवघनपाठिमहोदयेन । विश्वनाथशास्त्री पारायणस्य श्रोतासीत् । पारायणसमाप्तौ पारायणस्य कर्त्रे श्रोत्रे च दक्षिणा प्रमाणपत्रं च प्रदत्तम् ।

पुराणपाठः

१—यथापूर्वं चैत्रशुक्लप्रतिपत्तिथिम् आरभ्य नवमीं तिथिं यावद् रामनगरस्थिते जनकपुरमन्दिरे अध्यात्मरामायणस्य पाठः श्रीरामजीमिश्र-महोदयेन कृतः ।

२—आषाढशुक्लप्रतिपत्तिथिमारभ्य नवमीं तिथिं यावद् रामनगरस्थिते बालात्रिपुरसुन्दरीमन्दिरे त्रिपुरारहस्यस्य पाठः श्रीरामजीमिश्रमहोदयेन कृतः ।

पुराणविभागे समागता विद्वांसः

१—हरियाणा-भूमिविकास-बैंक इति संस्थानस्य अध्यक्ष-उपाध्यक्ष-सचिव-संहिताः षड् अधिकारिणः पुराणविभागे समागताः। एभिर्दर्शक-पुस्तिकायां लिखितम्—“अस्मिन् न्यासे अत्यल्पाधिकारिभिश्च यत् कर्म क्रियते तेन वयम् अतीव प्रभाविताः। न्यासेनानेन महत्त्वपूर्णं कार्यं क्रियते” इति। (७।१।८२ दिनाङ्के)।

२—प्रो० अवधकिशोरनारायणः (अमेरिका-देशस्थ-विस्कन्सिन—विश्वविद्यालयस्य प्राध्यापकः); अनेन लिखितम्—“पुनरिहागत्य इदं विज्ञाय महती प्रसन्नता जाता यदस्य शोधसंस्थानस्य कार्यं सदैव अनुकूलायां प्रतिकूलायां वा अवस्थायां साफल्यं प्राप्नुवदेव प्रचलति” इति। (२२।१।८२ दिनाङ्के)।

३—श्री रविन्ध्रिटे, ‘ब्रिटिशकाउन्सिल, कलकत्ता’ इत्यस्याधिकारी, वर्धमानराज्यस्य कुमारराणिना सह। एताभ्यां लिखितम्—“पुराणविषये क्रियमाणस्य महतः कार्यस्य अंशविशेषस्यावलोकनेन वयमतीव प्रसन्नाः। अस्मिन् कर्मणि संबद्धानां सर्वेषां कृते धैर्यस्य समर्पणभावस्य चातीव आवश्यकता भवति” इति।

४—डा. के. टी. पाण्डुरङ्गि, बंगलोरस्थितायाः ‘मिथिक् सोसायटी’-संस्थाया अध्यक्षः, तत्रस्थस्य पूर्णप्रज्ञविद्यापीठस्योपकुलपतिश्च (११।२।८२ दिनाङ्के)।

५—डा. सी. आर. स्वामिनाथन्, केन्द्रीयशिक्षामन्त्रालयस्य उपशिक्षा-परामर्शदाता (२।५।८२ दिनाङ्के)।

६—हेनरी ओ थाम्पसन—विश्वधर्मसभासमितेः सचिवः (शिकागो-नगरस्थः) (३१।५।८२ दिनाङ्के)।

डा० राजेन्द्रचन्द्रहाजरामहोदयस्य निधनम्

पुराणविषये विश्वविश्रुतो विपश्चिद् डा. राजेन्द्रचन्द्रहाजरा १०।५।८२ दिनाङ्के कलकत्तानगरस्थिते स्वीये वासगृहे निधनमवाप। अनेन महाभागेन पुराणविषये बहवो विद्वत्प्रशंसिता निबन्धा ग्रन्थाश्च प्रणीताः, पुराणविषयकानु-सन्धानस्य नूतनो मार्गश्च प्रदर्शितः। हाजरामहोदयः ‘पुराण’—पत्रिकायाः संपादकमण्डलस्य सदस्य आसीत्। न्यासाध्यक्षाः, अन्ये सदस्याः, पुराण-पत्रिका-सदस्याश्च निधनवृत्तान्तं विज्ञाय दुःखितान्तःकरणैः समवेदनां जापयन्ति, दिवंगतात्मनः शान्त्यै च प्रार्थयन्ति।

पुराणविभागे शोधछात्राः

शोधछात्रा विद्वांसश्च स्वकार्यसंपादनाय पुस्तकाद्यवलोकनार्थं पुराण-विषये मार्गदर्शनार्थं च पुराणविभागे प्रायशः समागच्छन्ति । सागरविश्व-विद्यालयस्य शोधछात्रा उमा सोना महाभागा जूनमासे केषुचिद् दिनेषु पुराण-विभागे समागताध्ययनार्थम् । 'अन्नदाचरण का व्यक्तित्व एवं कृतित्व' इत्यस्याः शोधविषयः ।

सहयोगि-न्यासानां कार्यविवरणम्

१. महाराजबनारसविद्यामन्दिरन्यासमङ्गलोत्सवः

वार्षिको वासन्तिक-मङ्गलोत्सवः १९८२ वर्षीय—मार्चमासस्य २-२८ दिनेषु सायंकाले ७ वादनतः ८ वादनं यावत् प्रतिदिनं रामनगरदुर्गे संपन्नः । दिवसत्रयात्मकः कार्यक्रमः तत्रभवतां न्यासाध्यक्षाणां महाराजानां डा. विभूतिनारायणसिंहमहोदयानां सान्निध्ये संपन्नः । सगीतोऽयमुत्सवः दुर्गस्य विद्या-मन्दिरप्राङ्गणे संपन्नः । न्यासाध्यक्षाः, नगरस्य विश्वविद्यालयस्य च विशिष्टा जनाः प्रतिदिनं उत्सवकार्यक्रमस्यावलोकनं चक्रुः । बहवो जनाः सावधाना भूत्वा शास्त्रीयं संगीतं शुश्रुवुः । शास्त्रीय-संगीतस्य कार्यक्रमः काशिक-हिन्दु-विश्वविद्यालयीय-संगीत-महाविद्यालयस्य छात्रैर्विहितः । अन्तिमे दिने कबीर-चौरा-स्थित-विद्यालयस्य त्रयश्छात्राः 'कथक-नृत्यं' प्रदर्शयामासुः ।

संग्रहालयः

वाराणसीमागतानां तीर्थयात्रिणां पर्यटकानां च कृते विद्यामन्दिरन्यासस्य संग्रहालयः शाश्वतम् आकर्षणकेन्द्रं वर्तते । यतोऽत्र शस्त्राणां हस्तिदन्तनिर्मित-वस्तूनां चातिविशालः संग्रहो विद्यते, अतः संग्रहालयोऽयं भारतवर्षे विशिष्टं स्थानं भजते । विशिष्टदर्शकेषु येषां हस्ताक्षराणि दर्शकपुस्तके सन्ति, त इमे—

१—किशनगढनरेशः श्रीमान् ब्रजराजसिंहः, श्रीप्रतापसिंहश्च ।

२—भारतस्थितस्य ब्रिटिशदूतावासस्य श्रीजानमहोदयः, लेडी थामस-महोदया च ।

३—प्रिन्स अञ्जुनकुदरमहोदयः (कलकत्तास्थितस्य 'अवधट्रस्ट'—इत्यस्याध्यक्षः) । एष महाभागो दर्शक-पुस्तके लिखति—“काशिराजस्य अतीव आनन्दकरी स्मरणीया च यात्रा । चतुष्पुरुष-व्यापी योऽस्माकं मैत्री-संबन्धः, तस्य नवीनीकरणं जातम्” इति ।

४—मध्यप्रदेशस्य खैरागढराज्यस्य मेजर—राजाबहादुर—वीरेन्द्रबहादुर सिंहः । अभिलिखितम्—“महानयं संग्रहालयः; भारतेऽद्वितीयः । स्वदेशेऽहं बहून् संग्रहालयान् तत्रत्यानि संगृहीतवस्तूनि च दृष्ट्वान्, परन्तु नूतनानां प्राचीनानां शस्त्राणां, हस्तिदन्तनिर्मितानां वस्तूनां, 'हौदा'—इत्यादिवस्तूनां च एवं-समृद्धः संग्रहः न मयान्यत्र कदापि दृष्टः । तत्र भवतः काशिराजान् प्रति संग्रहालयदर्शनार्थमहं धन्यवादान् वित्तरामि । वस्तुतोऽतीवशोभनरूपेण रक्षितोऽयं संग्रहालयः” इति ।

५—दिल्लीस्थितस्य वेलजियम-दूतावासस्य कुमारः तथा कुमारी जेटरटिन्स्की ।

६—अमेरिकनदूतावासस्य श्रीमान् माइकेलपिस्टो तथा तस्य पत्नी

७—दिल्लीस्थितस्य इटलीदेशस्य राजदूतः श्रीइमिलिओ पाओलो वामी । अनेन लिखितम्—“अस्मिन् प्रशस्ते राजभवने ममागमनमिदं द्वितीयम् । अस्त्रसमृद्धः, सुसंरक्षितश्च अत्रत्यः संग्रहालयः । कथमहं पनरागच्छेयम् इति जायते वाञ्छा” इति ।

ध्रुपदमेला

अष्टमो ध्रुपदमेलासमारोहो महाराजबनारस-विद्यामन्दिर-न्यासेन वाराणस्यां तुलसीघट्टे संपन्नः । समारोहार्थं ध्रुपदमेलास्थानम् अलङ्कृतम्, प्रकाशव्यवस्था च विहिता । यामिनीत्रयात्मकः कार्यक्रमः 'शामियाना'-प्रावरणस्याघोऽनुष्ठितः । बहवो जनाः (एषु केचन वैदेशिका युवानो युवत्यश्च आसन्) कृत्स्नां रात्रिं कार्यक्रमस्य श्रवणमकुर्वन् । समारोहेऽस्मिन् सदैव ध्रुपदगानविद्यायां प्रवीणाः पण्डिताः प्रदर्शनं कुर्वन्ति ।

चतुर्णाम् अभिनवप्रकल्पानां विषये घोषणा

पुराणविद्याया अभिवृद्धये काशिराजन्यासेन चत्वारोऽभिनवाः प्रकल्पाः संकल्पिताः । सर्वे पुराणविदो विद्वांसः अस्मिन् कर्मणि सहयोगाय प्रकामं निवेद्यन्ते ।

(१) अस्मद्देशे क्षेत्रीयभाषानिबद्धा बहवः पुराणग्रन्था विरचिताः । एतादृशसाहित्यविवरण-पराणां नवीनग्रन्थानां (Monograph) प्रकाशनम् न्यासेन संकल्पितम् । एषु ग्रन्थेषु प्रकाशित-हस्तलिखित-साहित्यस्य विवरणेन सह उद्धरणज्ञापितग्रन्थानां च विवरणमपि स्यात् ।

(२) पौराणिकविषयप्रतिपादनपराणां शोधग्रन्थानाम् अप्रकाशितानाम् प्रकाशनम् ।

(३) पुराणवर्णित-मुनिचरितविवरण-पराणां ग्रन्थानां (१०० पृष्ठादधिकानाम्) प्रकाशनम् ।

(४) पौराणिकविषय-प्रतिपादनपराणां लघु-संस्कृतग्रन्थानां संस्कृतविद्वद्विरचितानां प्राचीनानाम प्राचीनानां च प्रकाशनम् । पुराणपत्रिकायामपि इमे ग्रन्थाः प्रकाशनीयाः स्युः ।

अस्माकं सविनयमभ्यर्थना

सर्वासां शिक्षासंस्थानानामधिकारिणः सविनयमभ्यर्थ्यन्ते—यत्ते स्वस्व-संस्थानसदस्यैः शोधछात्रैर्वा लिखितानां लेखिष्यमाणानां वा पुराणविषयकाणां ग्रन्थानां विवरणमस्मत्सकाशे प्रेषयेयुः (पुराणशब्देन उपपुराणानि इतिहासश्च ग्राह्यानि) । पुराणाध्ययनगवेषणाविषये यदि तेषां केचन प्रकल्पाः स्युस्तर्हि तेषामपि संक्षिप्तं विवरणं प्रेषणीयम् । पुराणविषयकग्रन्थसूची-निर्माणाय उपर्युक्तग्रन्थविवरणं प्रकल्पविवरणं च अत्यन्तं आवश्यकम् ।

पुराणविषयरसिका विद्वांसो निवेद्यन्ते यत् ते पुराण-विषयिण्यो जिज्ञासाः प्रश्ना वा अस्मत्-सकाशे प्रेषयेयुः समाधानार्थम् । इमा जिज्ञासाः प्रश्ना वा समाहिता भविष्यन्ति पुराणविशेषज्ञैः; सति संभवे जिज्ञासा-मीमांसे पुराण-पत्रिकायां प्रकाशमेष्यतः ।

THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

OF

THE ALL-INDIA KASHIRAJ TRUST

1. His Highness Maharaja Dr. Vibhuti Narain Singh, M.A., D.Litt.;
Fort, Ramnagar, Varanasi.—(*Chairman*).

Trustees nominated by the Govt. of India :—

2. Dr. Raghunath Singh, M.A., Ph.D., D.Litt., LL.B.; Varanasi.

Trustees nominated by the Govt. of Uttar Pradesh :—

3. Pt. Kamalapati Tripathi, Member of Parliament, Govt.
of India, New Delhi.
4. Vacant.

Trustees nominated by His Highness the Maharaja of Banaras :—

5. Maharaj-Kumar Dr. Raghubir Singh, M. A., D. Litt.;
Raghubir Niwas, Sitamau (Malwa).
6. Pt. Giridhari Lal Mehta, Varanasi; Managing Director;
Jardine Handerson Ltd.; Scindia Steam Navigation Ltd.
Trustee : Vallabhram-Saligram Trust, Calcutta.
7. Pt. Baladeva Upadhyaya, M. A., Sahityacharya, Vachaspati;
Former Director, Sampurnananda Sanskrit University;
Ravindrapuri, Varanasi.

Donation made to All India Kashi Raj Trust, Fort Ramnagar, Varanasi, will qualify for exemption under Sec. 80G of the Income Tax Act, 1961 in the hands of donors, vide certificate No. 58/59 (253/80-81/Tech) dated 9.12.80

Printed at the Ratna Printing Works, Kamachha, Varanasi.

The 'Purāṇa', Bulletin has been started by the Purāṇa Department of the All-India Kashiraj Trust with the aim of organising the manifold studies relating to the Purāṇas. It specially discusses the several aspects of text-reconstruction, of the interpretation of the vast cultural and historical material, and of the obscure esoteric symbolism of legends and myths of the Purāṇas. The editors invite contributions from all those scholars who are interested in the culture of the Purāṇa literature in which the religion and philosophy of the Vedas have found the fullest expression.

Statement of ownership and other particulars about

पुराणम्—PURĀṆA

- | | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| 1. Place of Publication |Fort Ramnagar, Varanasi |
| 2. Periodicity of Publication | ...Half-yearly |
| 3. Printer's Name | ..., Vinaya Shankar |
| Nationality | ...Indian |
| Address |Ratna Printing Works,
B21/42 A, Kamachha, Varanasi |
| 4. Publisher's Name |Yogendra Narain Thakur
General Secretary, All-India
Kashiraj Trust |
| Nationality | ...Indian |
| Address |All-India Kashiraj Trust, Fort
Ramnagar, Varanasi. |
| 5. Editors' Name
with Address |R. K. Sharma (New Delhi),
Dr. R. N. Dandekar (Pune),
R. S. Bhattacharya (<i>Editor</i>)
(Purāṇa Deptt Fort Ramnagar,
Varanasi). |
| Nationality | ...Indian. |
| 6. Name of the owner |All-India Kashiraj Trust, Fort
Ramnagar, Varanasi. |

I, Yogendra Narain Thakur, hereby declare that the particulars given above are true, to the best of my knowledge.

Yogendra Narain Thakur
Publisher.

